Vol. I] NOVEMBER, 1943 [Part 1

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE



ALLAHABAD

Vol. I] NOVEMBER, 1943 [Part 1

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE



ALLAHABAD

Published by
Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra,
Ganganatha Jha Research Institute,
Allahabad.

Printed at
The Allahabad Block Works (P.) Ltd.,
Zero Road, Allahabad.

FOREWORD

For nearly a quarter of a century, if not more, it was impossible for any one here to talk of the Allahabad University and not to think at the same time of Sir Ganga Nath Jha. His reputation as a Sanskrit scholar had spread far beyond the confines of this country. It is only for those, who know Sanskrit or who are well-versed in Hindu philosophy to give a correct estimate of the contribution he made to the exposition of Hindu thought, but as one, who has been more or less interested in the various aspects of our intellectual life, I can say that wherever I went in India or outside I found scholars and savants speaking of him in terms of the greatest respect and veneration. I can say from personal knowledge that his translation of the Hindu Law text books, which I have on several occasions used in courts of law, are most illuminating and are monuments of learning and research. He lived the typical life of a Hindu Pandit,—by instinct and tradition a conservative, he was intensely proud of the contribution of our ancestors in the realm of thought and he considered it his duty—and none was more qualified than he—to interpret that thought to us in our generation. Above everything else he was the living example of—a life dedicated to the service of scholarship. If it is true to say of any one it may be said of him in all sincerity that his whole life was a life of plain living and high thinking. Altogether whether we look to his intellectual life or to the high standard of purity which he set in private life, he was a most valuable asset to the Allahabad University.

I am, therefore, glad that his admirers have taken the step to establish an Institution to be named after him. I am also glad that during the few months that we have

been working we have been able to raise something like Rs. 60,000. We are working for a much higher figure and when once we succeed in getting the necessary funds we hope to have a building of the Institute and to instal in it a library of Sanskrit and Persian and to bring out a series of books written by scholars and experts to perpetuate his memory. Meanwhile it has been decided by the Committee of which I happen to be the Chairman to issue a Journal as a tribute to his memory. I hope that this Journal will make a wide appeal and encourage us in the task we have undertaken out of respect to his memory.

TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE
NOVEMBER, 1943.

CONTENTS

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. I] NOVEMBER, 1943 [Part 1

OURSELVES

Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., Hony. F.R.A.S., closed a life of single-minded devotion to studies in Indian Philosophy, Hindu Law and Jurisprudence and other branches of Sanskrit learning at Allahabad on November 10, 1941. It is mainly his translation of most of our philosophical classics which has aroused the present widespread interest in Indian Philosophy in this country and abroad and our debt to him is thus unrepayable.

It occurred to some of the friends, admirers, and pupils of the great Pandit and philosopher that our gratitude could be given a visible shape by founding in his name an Oriental Research Institute in which the torch lighted by him could be kept burning, in which researches into our cultural heritage could be pursued, if possible, with his devotion. Dr. Jha himself could not have liked any other memorial. "Continue to be students" was always the advice he gave to scholars.

The Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga, Dr. Sir Kameshwara Singh, took the initiative and made a donation of Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand. With this initial grant in hand, an appeal was issued for more funds and Sir Padmapat Singhania of Cawnpore, H. H. Maharaja of Tehri-Garhwal, and other donors came forward with donations big and small.

Though we have not yet been able to collect together three lakhs of rupees which are necessary for the scheme

to start with and ten lakhs for its proper functioning, our receipts have been encouraging enough for making a start on the second anniversary of the *tithi* of Dr. Jha's journey to the other world, as a homage to his sacred memory.

Panditaji was born in Mithila in Bihar. But the greater part of his life was spent in the U.P., earlier as a student at Benares and later as a teacher and a Vice-Chancellor and also after retirement as a continuous worshipper of *Sarasvatī* at Allahabad. He thus properly belonged to the U.P.

He was the first man in this province to undertake serious research work on the Arts side. His example has spread in other centres of learning in the U.P. and good work is going on all over the province in various branches of Oriental Studies. It is but right that this province should raise a memorial in his honour. A Central Oriental Institute has been a great desideratum in this province and we hope that our Institute will remove that long-felt want. Certain other provinces can boast of similar Institutes but in a vast country like India there is room for more and more of these. We hope that this organisation associated with the name of one of the most illustrious of Orientalists of recent times will receive the co-operation of scholars all over the country and abroad.

We are deeply grateful to His Excellency the Governor of the U.P., His Excellency the Governor of Bihar, Professor Dr. Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, Dr. Panna Lall and Dr. Bhagavan Das for the messages they have sent to us.

As the first sign of our life we are publishing today this first number of a Quarterly Research Journal. We are highly thankful to the scholars from different parts of the country who have sent us their valuable contributions. Our one regret is that for lack of space we could not publish all of them in the first number. Others will go

into the second and subsequent issues. The enthusiastic response received from the scholarly world is a good augury and a proof, if proof is needed, of the esteem in which Dr. Jha was held by scholars. As we secure more funds, we shall come forward with other publications, of texts, translations and studies. May God Almighty enable us to make the Institute a fit memorial to the great scholar and may those efforts help in the spread of higher knowlẹdge in the land! Our prayer, therefore, is:

आरम्भोऽयं शुभायास्तु पत्रस्य संसदस्तथा ।
विद्यायाः प्रसरो येन संसिद्ध्येज्जगतीतले ॥

November 17, 1943.

MESSAGES

A year ago the United Provinces lost one of its most distinguished citizens, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, and no more fitting tribute to his memory could be paid than by the establishment of a Quarterly Research Journal devoted to Oriental Studies. Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha did much in his life-time to further classical study in India, and I wish the new Journal every success in carrying on his valuable work in his memory.

M. G. Hallet

Governor, United Provinces.

Although the late Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha's work lay in the United Provinces, he was a Bihari by birth and belonged to one of the best known families of the Province. Bihar may well be proud of such a distinguished son. But Dr. Jha belongs not to any particular Province but to India as a whole and it is appropriate that his memory should be honoured in the way which would have appealed to him most by the production of a Quarterly Journal devoted to research in Oriental Studies. Such an undertaking is bound to receive support not only from the Provinces with which the Mahamahopadhyaya was most intimately connected but from Scholars in every part of India.

R. F. Mudie

Governor, Bihar.

Professor Sir Ganganatha Jha's name will be remembered for long in connection with the development of Sanskrit studies in India. His monumental translations of Sanskrit Classics afford the source and material for a large number of dessertations for the Ph.D. and D.Litt. Degrees of Indian Universities. His combination of Orthodox learning with the Western methods of criticism is a rare phenomenon. I hope that his life and work will serve as an inspiration for others to follow in his footsteps and contribute to the advancement of Oriental Learning.

S. RADHAKRISHNAN

It is in the fitness of things that a Research Journal should be instituted to preserve the memory of Mahamahopadhyaya Ganganatha Jha for he was more than anything else a student and a teacher inspiring those around him by his shining example and encouraging them with sympathetic understanding. It is more than a quarter of a century ago that I first had the good fortune of meeting him. In connection with my Studies in Gupta Chronology, I was engaged in finding the proper interpretation of one of the Mandsor inscriptions and came to the conclusion that the meaning which Fleet sought to put on it was unnatural and forced to support a pre-conceived idea. Naturally, as a very young student in the field of research, I felt considerable hesitation in challenging an acknowledged master like Fleet. I turned to Ganganatha Jha. He gave me a great deal of his time and attention and finally, to my surprise and unspeakable joy, gave me a written opinion upholding my interpretation as against Fleet. That encouraged me to publish my results and correct many inaccuracies in Gupta Chronology, and my views were at once accepted by historians (*vide* Vincent Smith's *History of India*). I attribute the foundations

of my interest and confidence in historical research to Ganganatha Jha, whose name will always remain with me as a sacred and revered memory.

PANNA LALL

I cordially welcome the starting of the *Sir Ganganatha Jha Research Institute Journal*, and have every hope that it will do justice to the great learning of the departed Savant, my dear and now much missed friend, and will, at the same time, put *real life* into Sanskrit learning, language, literature (which Western Orientalists, not wholly without reason, regard as *dead*), by bringing them into active *helpful* touch with the various departments of the daily life of the Indian people; *e.g.*, by showing how the ancient '*Ārṣa*' principles of *Rāja-Śāstra* (*nīti*) and *Samāja-Śāstra* and *Artha-Śāstra* can be synthesised with those of modern Western Politics, Socionomics, and Economics; how the fundamental ideas of *Āyurveda* and the other *Upavedas* can be co-ordinated with those of the corresponding Western medical and other sciences; how the basic notions of *Jyotiṣa* can be reconciled with those of modern Astronomy; how modern Western metaphysics and psychology lead right up to *Vedānta-Sāṅkhya-Yoga* and so forth;—and, all this governed and inspired by the definite *purpose* of lifting up the life of the Indian People from the depths of moral, intellectual, economical, domestic, social, political, and spiritual degradation, into which it has fallen.

I wish every success to the Journal along these lines.

BHAGAVAN DAS

KALPA OR THE WORLD-CYCLE

BY DR. R. SHAMA SASTRY

In the Hindu astronomical works and also in the Purāṇas the creator of the world is assigned a day of 1000 *Yugas* and a night of the same duration. The world is stated to disappear at the end of the period and to reappear in its original form at the close of the night period. This fantastic notion seems to have its origin in the Vedic eclipse-cycle of 1000 *Yugas*. We may go so far as to say that the Vedic statement that the creator sets the sun and the moon as before (*Sūryā-candramasau dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat divaṃ ca pṛthivīṃ cāntarikṣamatho svaḥ*,—X. 190, 3) is taken to mean the creation of the world at the end of a *Kalpa*. *The Bhagavadgītā* says (VIII. 17—19) :—Those who know the creator's day-period of 1000 *Yugas* and also his night period of same length understand what a day and night mean precisely. At the dawn of the creator's day the whole universe manifests itself from the unknown and lies merged within the same unknown at night. Thus the appearance and disappearance of the world with the same life and matter as before are said to recur cycle after cycle of 1000 *Yugas*

A *Yuga* means *Parva* or a fortnight. As pointed out in "*The Drapsa*" and also in "*The Eclipse-cult*", the Vedic eclipse-cycle of 1000 *Yugas* or *Parvas* of $14\frac{3}{4}$ days each is equal to forty years nearly, while in the fancied world-cycle it is interpreted to mean 1000 *Yugas* of 12000 divine years, or 4,32,0000 human years. If we take a *Parva* to be equal to 14 days, as the Vedic poets seem to have done avoiding fraction, then 1000 *Parvas*, or 14000 days come to be nearly equal to 39 years and a few months. Splitting this period into two parts of 7000 days each, the

Vedic poets called each part a *Sapta-puruṣa*-cycle, a *Puruṣa*-cycle being taken to be a period of 1000 days, with at least three visible eclipses, solar or lunar or both to gether on an average. 1029 days consitute three nodal or eclipse years of 343 days each. In each eclipse year no more than four eclipses, two solar and two lunar, can possibly occur. Sometimes, there may be in the same locality one visible eclipse or none at all in a nodal year. In three nodal years there can possibly be no more than 12 eclipses and not less than three visible eclipses in the same locality. Eclipses are variously called in the Vedas. They were sometimes called three brothers, or three fathers, *i.e.*, father, grand-father, and great-grand-father. The three descriptive designations given to the three eclipses of a cycle of 1000 days are *Paṭara*, one of dusky appearance, *Viklidha*, one of black colour, and *Piṅga*, one of yellow colour. An eclipse is generally called a *Putra*, or *Vatsa*, or *Prajā*, all meaning a son. In *Ṛ.V.* 1, 164, 1 the three eclipses are called *Palita*, grey, *Aśna*, black, and *Ghṛtapṛṣṭha*, as yellow as ghee. If there were 17 eclipses in the order 4, 4, 2, 5, and 2 in five successive cycles of 1000 days or rather five successive years, this rare occurrence of 17 seems to have received the name of *Prajāpati* or *Viṣṇu*. The mnemonic formula denoting this phenomenon is "*Āśrāvaya, astu śrauṣaṭ, Yaja, yeyajāmahe, vauṣaṭ*", where each of the seventeen syllables stands for an eclipse. In "*The Drapsa*" I took this formula to signify a cycle of 17 years. Now, I find that it signifies rather the occurrence of 17 eclipses in the order noted above.

The *Apri* hymns contain a formula of offerings to be made to *Indra* on the days of eclipses observed in the course of 33 years made up of two cycles, namely, one of 19 years and the other of 13 years with one intercalary year. The number of eclipses observed during the minor cycle of 13

years is stated to be not less than 33 and not more than 35. They are sometimes counted as eleven on earth, eleven in air, and eleven in the sky, and at other times as eight *Vasus*, eleven *Rudras*, twelve *Ādityas*, and two called *Dyāvāpṛthivī*, earth and sky. The thirty-three gods connected with the *Apri* hymns are not only year-gods, but eclipse-gods. Eclipses of smaller digits are called lambs (*Avis*) and those of greater digits bulls. In the *Mantras* of *Prayājas* and *Anuyājas* connected with the *Apri* hymns *Indra's* age is given in terms of eclipses called *Tryavis* or three lambs in the course of 18 months, *Pañcāvis* or five lambs in the course of 30 months or in the course of 6 months, three being observed on one node in the course of a month, and two on the other node after six months. Draught oxen, a cow with a calf, or a bull are names of eclipses of larger digits. Counting the number of all visible eclipses, both solar and lunar, given in the Eclipse-table in Swamikannu Pillae's Indian Ephemeris, the average number of visible eclipses for a hundred years is found to be about 252, 99 solar and 153 lunar. As pointed out in "The Eclipse-cult", *Sambara* is a demon causing an eclipse, and his three forts (*Puras*) are usually called an iron-castle, a silver-castle, and a gold-castle. In animal nomenclature they are called a black lamb, a white lamb, and a red lamb. (Tait. S. 6, 2, 3; and 2, 1, 3). In *Ṛ.V.* 2, 12, 11 *Indra* is stated to have found out *Sambara* hidden in the mountains in the fortieth autumn and destroyed his 90, 99, or 100 castles (*Ṛ.V.* 1, 130, 7; 2, 19, 6; 4, 26, 3; 2, 14, 6; 4, 30, 2; 6, 31, 4.). This is the Vedic way of stating that there were 90 to 100 eclipses, both solar and lunar, observed in the course of 39 years and two months, which is equal to two cycles of 19 years. If the average for 39 years is about 100 eclipses, the average for thirteen years, which is one-third of 39, is 33 eclipses, sometimes it may be 34 or 35

These eclipse-gods should, however, be distinguished from the gods of intercalary months known as *Dhātā*, *Aryamā*, *Mitra*, *Varuṇa*, *Aṃśa*, *Bhaga*, and *Indra*, the eighth called *Mārtaṇḍa* having been rejected as still-born. The total number of these gods of intercalary months is said to amount to 720 in the course of 2280 years, which is equal to 120 cycles of 19 years each. The number of these gods would have come to 840, if the god of the seventh intercalary month in each cycle of 19 years is also counted. But only six were counted in each cycle. (*cf. Calcutta Review* for September 1942). The purpose for which the intercalary months are devised is to equalise the lunar months with the solar months so as to bring the sun and the moon together at the year-end, *i.e.*, to make the solar and the lunar years terminate on the new moon day. Hence, the cycle of 19 years is an eclipse-cycle and also luni-solar cycle. Likewise, the cycle of 33 years (19+14=33) is also a luni-solar cycle in which 33 lunar years with one intercalary year and 32 solar years terminate on the same day, *i.e.*, on a new-moon day. It is made of 19 years plus 7 intercalary months, plus 13 years, and plus 5 intercalary months, *i.e.*, 32 ordinary lunar years and one intercalary lunar year. Thus, the cycle of 19 years, 13 years, 39 years and two months are all lustrams or purificatory years; since seven, five, and 14 intercalary months called *Malamāsa*s or dirty months are got rid of in those cycles. They were originally called *Kalpa* days, since the sun and the moon came into conjunction on the last day of those cycles.

On the basis of the definition of *Yugas*, *Manvantaras*, and *Kalpa* found in the *Purāṇas* and the *Amarakośa*, the original scheme of *Kalpas* may be recast as follows:—

(1) A day and night make two units of time called day-*kalpa* and night-*kalpa* for men.

(2) Two halves of 14 days each of a lunar month make day-*kalpa* and a night-*kalpa* for Fathers in heaven.

(3) Two halves of a year make a day-*kalpa* and a night-*kalpa* for gods.

(4) Seventy-one or seventy-two such *Yugas* or pairs of day-and-night-*kalpas* make a *Manvantara*.

(5) Twice fourteen *Manvantaras* ($2 \times 14 \times 72$ days and nights) or two thousand *Yugas* or pairs of units of time make a day-*kalpa* and a night-*kalpa* for *Brahmā*, the Creator.

(6) In other words, 1000 days or $2\frac{3}{4}$ lunar years with one intercalary month make a *Yuga* for men.

(7) 14000 days or 1000 *Parva-yugas* with 14 intercalary months make a *Yuga* for Fathers in heaven.

(8) 2000 *Ayana-yugas* or $2000 \times 6 \times 2 \times 14$, or $2 \times 2 \times 6 \times 14000$ days with 24×14, or 333 intercalary months, or 940 years make a day-*kalpa* and a night-*kalpa* for the Creator. If we take a *Parva* to be equal to $14\frac{3}{4}$ days instead of 14 days, then the duration of a *Kalpa* would come to 500 years nearly or to 1000 years taking day-and-night-*kalpas* together. It should be particularly noticed how number seven forms an important factor in the above *kalpa* scheme. The verses of *Amara* are as follows :—

"*Māsena syādahorātraḥ paitro varṣeṇa daivataḥ.*
Daive yugasahasre dve Brāhmaḥ kalpau tu tau nṛṇām.
Manvantaraṃ tu divyānāṃ yugānāmekasaptatiḥ."

It needs no explanation that this simple scheme of days, fortnights, months, years, lustram of five years, with

eclipse-cycles of 19, 13, 39 years was transformed into huge *yugas*, *Manvantaras*, and *kalpas* of astronomical *Siddhāntas*.

The return of the sun and the moon to the same point with the same eclipse phenomena cycle after cycle or *kalpa* after *kalpa* is hinted in the Ṛgvedic *Śunaśśepa-sūktas* or hymns addressed by *Śunaśśepa* to king *Varuṇa* for release from the sacrificial post to which he was tied to be sacrificed. Before taking up the verses it seems necessary to know the legend of *Śunaśśepa*, as given in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* :—

"King Hariścandra, son of Vedhas of Ikṣvāku line, was childless, although he had one hundred wives. In his house lived Parvata and Nārada. The latter advised the king to go to *Varuṇa* and say to him "May a son be born to me, and I shall sacrifice him to you." *Varuṇa* said "Yes". Accordingly, a son, named *Rohita*, was born, but the king put off the sacrifice from time to time saying (1) let the victim pass ten days (during which the child is impure in the *Sūtikāgṛha*); (2) let his teeth come; (3) let his teeth fall out; (4) let his teeth come again; (5) and let him become a warrior (*Kṣatriya*) girt with his armour. *Varuṇa* granted all these requests successively. When he became a warrior the king asked him to consent to be sacrificed; but he said "No"; and taking his bow ran away to the forest and lived there for a year. *Varuṇa* seized Hariścaṇdra whose belly thereupon swelled by dropsy. *Rohita* heard of this and five times he set out successively in the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years to go back to his father; but each time *Indra* came in the form of a *Brāhmaṇa* and induced him not to go. While he was travelling in the forest in the sixth year, he met a starving *Ṛṣi*, named Ajīgartha, son of Sūyavasa, a descendant of *Aṅgiras*. Ajīgartha had three sons, Sunaḥpuccha, Śunaśśepa, and Sunolāṅgūla. Purchasing

the middle son for a hundred cows (for the father would not part with the first and the mother with the last son), *Rohita* came to his father, who then went to *Varuṇa* and said: "I shall sacrifice this man to you" *Varuṇa* said: "All right; a Brāhmaṇa is better than a Kṣatriya" Then commenced the sacrifice called *Rājasūya*, in which Viśvāmitra officiated as the *Hotṛ*, Jamadagni as *Adhvaryu*, Vaśiṣṭha as *Brahmā*, and Ayāsya as *Udgātṛ*. They found no body to bind *Śunaśśepa* to the sacrificial post and kill him. His father Ajīgartha volunteered to do these acts for another hundred cows. He bound him and came whetting his sword. Then *Śunaśśepa* prayed to *Varuṇa* and other gods, and at last to the *Uṣas* in three verses, of which the first, as soon as he repeated, loosened the cord, the second thinned Hariścandra's belly, and the last completely liberated *Śunaśśepa* and made Hariścandra well again."

In my article entitled "*Test of the Eclipse-cycle*"[1] I showed how *Rohita* meant a lunar eclipse of *Piṅga* or yellowish colour occurring in each cycle of 1000 days. I see no reason why *Rohita* of the above story should not be taken to be a lunar eclipse of the same type. Hariś-candra, as the name itself implies, is the moon, and his son *Rohita* can be no other than the same eclipsed moon, as the three eclipses of a cycle are usually called father, son, and grand-son (*Ṛ.V.* 1, 164. 1). I am inclined to take *Śunaśśepa*, and his two brothers to be the names of the same three lunar eclipses known as *Paṭara*, *Viklidha*, and *Piṅga*. Mr. Raja Rao, M.A., thinks that these are some three stars in the region of *Canis Major* and *Canis Minor*, the seven Bears, and the Dog-star, and that Ajīgartha, meaning a deep pit of a serpent, is *Aśleṣā*, the deity of which is *Ahi*, a serpent. As the lunar eclipses happened near these stars, they were also affected by the

---

[1] The *Poona Orientalist*, January, 1941.

shadow and made to pray to *Varuṇa* for release. It is of no consequence whether the eclipsed moon in the region of Cancer and Leo is called by these names or some three more stars near the Dog-star (*Sunāśīra*) in the same region are so called. What is of great importance is the occurrence of a lunar eclipse in that region, the sun being in the constellation called *Śatabhiṣaj* from which *Aśleṣā* and *Maghā* are the thirteenth and fourteenth asterisms, being 180 from the sun. The verses in which the identification of *Śunaśśepa* with one of these three eclipses occuring cycle after cycle is hinted are verses 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of *Ṛ.V*. 1, 24 and verse 8 of 1, 25.

'Hundred, nay a thousand, are thy physicians; may thy great and deep good-will be noble; drive away *Nirriti* (Eclipse-demon) far; and remove my sinful bonds.

(The asterism, *Śatabhiṣaj*, whose deity is *Varuṇa*, is also meant here.)

'Those Bears that are set up high in the sky are seen at night and go out somewhere during the day. Unaltered and uncontradicted are thy laws, O *Varuṇa*; and at night the moon goes to the *Nakṣatra* with lustre.

(The implication is that the moon is devoid of her usual lustre and that the Bears are not clearly visible, due to eclipse)

'Therefore, I approach thee bowing with prayers; the same thing the sacrificer hopes to attain to by his food-offerings; O Praise-worthy *Varuṇa*, take this prayer to thy mind without anger; do not rob me of my life.

'The same is the night; the same the day; so they say to me; the same thought rises in my breast; the same is King *Varuṇa* to whom *Śunaśśepa* once prayed for release when caught hold of before; I am the same *Śunaśśepa* that is now caught hold of and prays for release as before.

(Believing that *Śunaśśepa* is a human substitute for *Rohita* to be sacrificed, Skandasvāmī, the commentator, says—"*Atītakalpe yaśśunaśśepa āsīt ahameva saḥ gṛbhītaḥ gṛhītaḥ*'—'the same *Śunaśśepa* who was once caught hold of in a former *Kalpa* of 1000 divine *Yugas* am I now in bonds on the same night of the same day of the same year in the present *Kalpa* of 1000 divine *Yugas*.' For reasons set forth above I hold that this is a reference to the return of the same kind of *Rohita* eclipse in a second cycle of 1000 days in the sixth year.)

Śunaśśepo hyahvadgṛbhītastriṣvādityaṃ drupadeṣu baddhaḥ.

Avainaṃ rājā varuṇassasṛjyādvidvānadabdho vimumoktu pāśān. 13

'(I), *Śunaśśepa* called upon thee, O *Varuṇa*, when I was bound to three posts (Foot-holds of the tree on three occasions before); May King *Varuṇa*, omniscient and unassailed, release the same *Śunaśśepa* from the bonds.'

Here the expression "*Triṣu drupadeṣu*" means on three foot-holds of a tree, and not three ropes and one tree or post. Skandasvāmī says that though there is as a rule only one *Pāśa* or rope to bind the victim by its head to the post, the reference to three bindings, one round the neck, one round the loins, and one round the legs here is an exception in the case of a human victim like *Śunaśśepa* with a view to make him firm and unshaken at the time of slaughter. There is, however, no room for this objection raised and the explanation offered by the commentator. The text clearly mentions three foot-holds of a tree, implying three bindings on three different occasions. The acts performed in the sacrificial hall are, as I have

pointed out in the "Eclipse-cult", imitations of the eclipse phenomena observed in the sky. Accordingly, the heavenly victim corresponding to the human victim in the sacrificial hall is the eclipsed moon, as pointed out above. What then is the *Drupada* or foot-hold of the tree to which the eclipsed planet was believed to have been bound? It is the *Aśvattha* or *Pippala* tree which is described in *Ṛ.V.* 1, 164, 20 as the abode of the sun and the moon. Accordingly, it may be inferred that the *Pippal* tree was one of the constellations, through which the two planets make their yearly and monthly revolutions. While explaining Pāṇini IV. iii. 48 Vāsudeva Dīkṣita, the author of *Bālamanoramā*, says that *Kālāpaka* means a debt payable at the time when pea-cocks have their feathers fully grown; *Aśvatthaka*, a debt payable at the time when the fruits of *Pippala* tree ripen; and *Yavabusaka*, a debt payable at the time when barley grains ripen. Again, while explaining Pāṇini IV. ii. 5 (*Sañjñāyāṃ śravaṇāśvatthābhyām*) he says that *Aśvattha* means the constellation *Aśvinī*. Others take it to signify the arterism *Śravaṇā* on the authority of *Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā* identifying *Aśvattha* with *Śravaṇā*. This interpretation seems to be justifiable in as much as the *Aśvattha* tree bears fruit at the summer season when the moon becomes full in *Śravaṇā* and the sun arrives at *Puṣya*. At the time of Pāṇini the arrival of the sun at the constellation of *Puṣya* marked the time of summer season and summer solstice. Accordingly, if the asterism *Puṣya* marked the top of the *Aśvattha* tree, its root or foot must necessarily be in *Śravaṇā*. New moon at *Śravaṇā* marked the arrival of winter solstice and new moon at *Puṣya* the arrival of summer solstice. It is very well known that Pāṇini flourished at about B.C. 500 to 400, when Mahāvira, the author of *Sūryaprajñapti*, lived and preached Jainism. The *Vedāṅgajyautiṣa* located the summer sols-

tice at the first half of *Aśleṣā* and the winter solstice at *Dhaniṣṭhā*. Making allowance for defective observations, late Svamikannu Pillae, the author of Indian Ephemeris, fixed the date of .the *Jyautiṣa* at about 800 to 900 B.C. Others put it at 1200 to 1400 B.C. From this it follows that the solstices were at the end of *Aśleṣā* and the beginning of Dhaniṣṭhā at about 1300 to 1400 B.C. and that the same must have been located at the end of *Maghā* and the beginning of *Śatabhiṣaj* about 2200 B.C., and at the latter half of *Pūrvaphalgunī* and the first half of *Pūrvabhādrapada* at about B.C. 3100. This is in complete agreement with the conclusions arrived at by B. G. Tilak on consideration of the shifting of the vernal equinox from *Mṛgaśīrṣa* to *Kṛttikā*, and by Jacobi on consideration of the precession of the solstices from *Phalgunīs* to *Aśleṣā*.

There is also an additional proof furnished by the nomenclature of the constellations. The constellation of *Pūrvabhādrapada* is called *Aherbudhnya*, the tail of the serpent and the constellation of *Aśleṣā* is called *Ahi*. serpent. The reason why these *Nakṣatras* are called the tail and the mouth of the serpent seems to be the frequency of eclipses when the serpent *Svarbhānu* is believed to devour the sun at solar and the moon at lunar eclipses. If the serpent's mouth is *Aśleṣā*, then its tail, the other node, must necessarily be the asterism of *Dhaniṣṭhā*, which is 180 from it. Similarly, if the constellation of *Śatabhiṣaj* is the tail, then the mouth of the serpent or the ascending node must be the *Maghās;* and if the tail is *Pūrvabhādrpada*, then its mouth must be *Pūrvaphalgunī*. Similarly, *Uttarabhādrapada*, called *Aja Ekapād* and *Uttaraphalgunī* can be the tail and mouth of the serpent. The situation of the solstices in *Pūrvabhādrapada* and *Pūrvaphalgunī* is mentioned in the hymn on *Rohita* in the *Atharvaveda*: it says that at one end of the thread

held by *Prajāpati* rested *Aja Ekapāda* and that the other end of the thread lay at *Pūrvaphalgunī*.*

What deserves special attention in this connection is the significance and purpose of the sacrificial victims, such as a man, a horse, a cow, a goat, or sheep and the like. Unless we understand the nature of the dice-play, we cannot fully grasp the significance of the victims. In the dice-play there are two players with specified wager or stake laid before the umpire. The stage is called *Glaha* in Pāṇini (1. 3. 7) and in the *Ṛgveda* it is called *Glabha*, a word which is derived from the root "*Gṛbh*" to take. The perfect participle "*Gṛbhīta*," used in the *Śunaśśepa* hymn (1, 24, 12) meaning 'taken as stake,' is from the same root. In the dice-play in the sky the two players are the sun and the moon, as stated in *Ṛ. V*. X. 18. The stake laid by them must necessarily be their own person or their horses. If the player's own person is laid as a stake, it seems to have been called *Nara*, cow, goat, or sheep in the ratio of decreasing value corresponding to the varying digits of the eclipse. The winner not only took the defeated person as a stake, but also tied the victim to a post in his own house to be disposed of at his own pleasure. The house in the case of the sun and the moon is either foot-hold or the top of *Aśvattha* tree. The form of the play is *Kṛta*, *Tretā*, *Dvāpara*, or *Kali*. If the sun or the moon in the game of running made a *Kṛta-yuga* or a number of *Parvas* divisible by four with no remainder, then he is considered to be the winner, as agreed upon. In solar eclipse the moon is the winner and in the lunar the sun. The defeated planet is tied to the foot-hold or top of the *Vanaspati*, the *Aśvattha* tree, to be disposed of at the will of the winner. It is probable that if the eclipse was two *Padas* out of four-*padas*, *i.e.*,

* 'Test of the Eclipse-cult,' published in the *Poona Orientalist*, January, 1941.

half, it is called *Nara*, man standing on two *Padas* or legs; if it is of four *padas*, it is a cow. If very small, it is an *Avi*, sheep; the value of one kind of victim in terms of other victims requires further investigation.

It is a game of *Tretā*, if the number of *Farvas* run leaves a remainder of three when divided by four; it is *Dvāpara*, if it leaves a remainder of two when divided by four; and it is called *Kali*, if it leaves a remainder of one when divided by four.

An eclipse is regarded not merely as game of dice-play or race of running, but also a battle between the gods led by the sun or the moon, and the demons under the lead of *Śambara*, *Vṛtra*, *Nirriti*, and others of various names, when the defeated planet is searched and caught hold of to be bound to the victory pillar or set at liberty on payment of an adequate ransom of the value of a horse, a cow, a goat, a sheep, a slave, or a woman, or gold or a valuable cloth-piece. Sometimes, it is also conceived as an act of devouring one of the two planets by *Svarbhānu* and the release of the swallowed is considered to be effected by incantation and power of prayer or *Vāk*, song, in Vedic terminology.

The binding of *Śunaśśepa* thrice in his former births in one or three former *Kalpas* and the recurrence of the same binding in the present *Kalpa* referred to in verse 12 is no more than the recurrence of the *Rohita*-type of the three eclipses of the previous cycle of 1000 days. This is also implied in the 8th verse of the 25th hymn of the first *Maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda* :—

'May king *Varuṇa* who is omniscient and who is unopposed release the same *Śunaśśepa* from the ropes (*Pāśas*). *Varuṇa* knows full well the twelve productive months and also that which comes into being along with them.'

The twelve productive months are the usual twelve months of a year and the month which is said to come along with them is the unproductive intercalary month which is called *Mala-māsa* or unclean month infested with *Nirriti* and other evil spirits. The simple contrivance which the Vedic poets had devised to ascertain the arrival of an eclipse-season was the luni-solar *Yuga* of 2½ years or more correctly 1000 days. The usual average number ot eclipses for 1000 days is three, as already pointed out. Of these three one is called *Rohita* or one of reddish yellow which according to the express statement of the *Tait. Āraṇyaka* (1, 2) recurs in every cycle of 1000 days. This is the minor *Kalpa* while the major *Kalpa* is 1000 *Parva Yugas* of 14000 days equal to two cycles of 19 years each or 39 solar years and two months which we may call a *Śambara* cycle of eclipses.

From this it follows that a *Kalpa* in its origin meant an eclipse-cycle of nearly 19 years and not a period of 1000 divine *Yugas* of 4,32,0000 years, as believed by the commentator Skandasvāmī and the authors of the astronomical *Siddhāntas*.

The search for a gambler who has run away after being vanquished is mentioned in *Ṛ.V.* X. 43, 5 :-

As a gambler searches (*vicinoti*) his escaped adversary, so does Indra go in quest of the sun who concealing his wealth (*samvarga*) hid himself. No one, O Maghavan, ancient or modern, is able to imitate this thy vigour.

A FAKE (?) "BHAGAVADGĪTĀ" MS.

By Dr. S. K. Belvalkar

The search for the "original" *Bhagavadgītā* continues to be a problem as intriguing as ever. The search has followed along two main lines. The first sets forth as its goal a poem considerably reduced in size and conveying 'unitary and self-consistent' teaching. The second essays to present the world with a poem that should agree with a recorded description of its contents,[1] which makes it a poem of 745 instead of the present 700 stanzas. But what definite and compelling evidence have we to imagine that the *Bhagavadgītā* proper was at any time different originally from what we know it to be ever since the days of the commentator Śaṅkara (cir. 800 A.D.)?

That the present poem is far too lengthy for being recited on the battle-field; that it is far too technical in some places, and far too prolix in others; that its teaching and terminology are not self-consistent and have evoked a battle royal amongst the *Bhāṣyakāras;* that in places we can even catch the interpolator red-handed: such are some of the arguments urged by those that stand for an "original" *Gītā*, which Garbe at first sought to recover by cutting off, on alleged philological or objective grounds, some 172 stanzas from the current *Gītā*, and which eventually was made out by his pupil R. Otto to contain just 133 stanzas and no more. The various proofs in detail cannot be gone into in this place.[2] By

---

[1] The well-known stanza and a half included in the *Gītā-praśasti* found at the beginning of Chapter 43 of the *Bhīṣmaparvan* in the Nīlakaṇṭha recension of the *Mahābhārata*.

[2] See my Basu Mallik Lectures (1929), Pt. i, pp. 94—100; and "*Examination of Otto's attempted Stratification of the BG.*" 1937.

way of a general remark we can say that the author of the *Mahābhārata* composed the *Bhagavadgītā* after the heat of the battle had subsided; and as the *Mahābhārata* was designed to be a Dharmaśāstra, the author gave through our poem his own exposition of the Philosophy of Right Conduct, which, naturally, could not have been altogether non-technical. Further, if—as is likely—the author attempted in that exposition to give a coherent synthesis of the divergent viewpoints current at the time, our understanding of the author will be correct only if we catch the synthetist's exact angle of vision. This has not unfortunately always been the case.[3]

The champions of the *Bhagavadgītā* of 745 stanzas had a much simpler problem to deal with. The earliest in the field (1917) was the *Śuddha-Dharma-Maṇḍala-Gītā* of 26 chapters, which was alleged to be based upon an actual MS.,[4] the antiquity and authenticity of which have not been properly examined and established. The latest in the field (1941) is the so-called "*Bhojapatrī*"-*Gītā* edited 'from an old MS.' by Pandit Kalidas Śāstrī, the Rājavaidya of Gondal. In between came Pandit R. M. Shastri's attempt[5] grounded on the supposition that by *Śloka* we have to understand 32 syllables; and my own attempt[6] to prove that the traditionally recorded extent belongs not to the *Bhagavadgītā* alone, but to the *BG* and the *Gītāsāra* *taken together*, which, actually, in some old *Mbh.* MSS. and in the Persian translation of the Epic are found given

[3] In my *BORI* Silver Jubilee series of Twentyfive Lectures (now in press) some of the commoner defects in the current interpretation of the *BG* are discussed.

[4] On this see F. Otto Schrader's paper in the *New Indian Antiquary*, I. i, pp. 62—68.

[5] *Allahabad University Studies*, XII (Arts and Science), pp. 66—82. On it see S. N. Tadpatrikar's paper in the *Annals*, *BORI*, Vol. xviii, pp. 357—360.

[6] "The Bhagavadgītā 'Riddle' Unriddled," *Annals*, *BORI*, Vol. xix, Pt. iv, pp. 335-348.

together in immediate succession.—The object of the present paper is to examine the claim of the "*Bhojapatrī*" *Gītā* to be the "original" *Gītā* of 745 stanzas.

The *Bhagavadgītā* given in this edition follows the so-called Kashmir Recension of the poem, which the same editor had published from Gondal in 1937. In the Introduction to that edition the editor had written :

"Our one great ambition is to secure the text containing 745 stanzas. Our MS. contains 7 or rather 7½ additional stanzas. It now remains for us to discover the 37 or 38 stanzas missing from the speech of Śrīkṛṣṇa (p. 11) . . . . We have undertaken to complete the missing stanzas of the *Gītā*. For this purpose we are sending for the copies of all these MSS. We are receiving much help from our grand Pandit Shri Hariramji Panchodi in securing old MSS. of the *Gītā* in Sanskrit or Persian. . . . . On securing the wanting MSS. of the *Gītā*, the work of completing the missing stanzas will be accelerated (p. 25)."

This urgent demand was bound to create a supply, and it was the same Pandit H. Pancholi mentioned in the above passage who came forward with a birch-bark MS definitely dated (*Saṃ*. 1665) and answering in every detail to the specifications demanded. After carefully examining the text of the *Bhagavadgītā* as presented by this MS. I have come to the conclusion that it is a "fake" MS. Benares has had the unenviable reputation of being the manufacturing place of fake coins, fake images, and fake antiquities of all sorts. We had no idea that the trade would spread to so ancient and revered a text as the *Bhagavadgītā*. Some of the main arguments warranting such a conclusion will be briefly stated here.[7]

---

[7] I have given a fuller treatment in the *Puruṣārtha*, a Marathi monthly, for March, 1942.

The birch-bark MS, which is paraded before the world with much ado is, in the first place, not written (as is the case with old and genuine birch-bark MSS.), in *Śāradā* characters, but in *Devanāgarī* characters. Apparently, writing in old *Śāradā* characters proved too much for the Benares scribe who produced the MS. The *Devanāgarī* is written with *Pṛṣṭhamātrās*, which was easy enough to do. The date of writing given at the end of the MS. is marked by such extreme mathematical accuracy that that itself creates a suspicion. The date runs thus:

"विक्रमसंवत् १६६५, माघ कृष्ण १, प्रतिपदी मन्दवासरे ।"

According to the North-Indian mode of reckoning,

गतसंवत् १६६५ माघ कृष्ण १ = प्रवर्तमान संवत् १६६६, पौष कृष्ण १ ।

The Full-moon preceding this *Pratipadā* falls on a Saturday (मन्दवासरे) so that one expects the *Pratipadā* itself to be on a Sunday. But the Full-moon *Tithi* in question ends with the sunset and the *Pratipadā* commences on the same Saturday after sunset. If therefore we imagine that the copying of the MS. went on in daytime and was concluded at night, we have the Saturday as well as the *Pratipadā*, and the data tally to a T. We wonder if an ordinary scribe would exactly bear in mind when the *Tithi* changed and make the entry so minutely accurate.

The text given by this new *Gītā* bodily accepts the text of the Gondal edition of 1937, preserving all its peculiarities and even blunders,[8] particularly in the matter of arbitrarily making a stanza consist of 2 or 6 quarters (*pādas*), without stopping to consider whether the sense-

---

[8] Thus, in *BG*, xv, 13 the Gondal edition reads मामाविश्य for गामाविश्य which gives no sense at all. The "*Bhojapatrī*" text (xv. 15) gives the same reading! Naturally they could not afford to sacrifice the importance of the Gondal edition by correcting its mistakes!

completion requires such shorter or longer stanzas. As the 1937 Gondal text adopted the Kashmirian recension, the "*Bhojapatrī*" edition adopts the same. But I have shown in detail[9] that the Kashmirian Recension is secondary and late, because it systematically tries to normalize the archaic grammar and syntax of the current text. The claim of such a *Gītā* to be considered the "original" *Gītā* stands *ipso facto* refuted by all the accepted canons of text-criticism.

The greatest bungle of the "*Bhojapatrī*"-*Gītā* is, however, the frantic way in which it introduces all sorts of quotations from the *Upaniṣads*, old and new, to make up the full quota of Śrīkṛṣṇa's stanzas. There are full 37 such quotations, which we enumerate here *seriatim* :

—After ii. 17 we have :

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत् तथा ।
वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥

The stanza disturbs the context. The body may have a beginning and an end, but the *BG* nowhere says that therefore the middle state of the body is illusory or *Māyika*. The stanza occurs in the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* ii. 6 and iv. 31. For the *BG* to quote these *Kārikās*, commonly attributed to *Gauḍapāda*, seems utterly unhistorical.

—After ii. 70 the following three stanzas are found :

यस्यामतं तस्य मतं मतं यस्य न वेद सः ।
विजानतामविज्ञातं विज्ञातमविजानताम् ॥
प्रतिबोधेन तद्ब्रह्म विदित्वा लभ्यतेऽमृतम् ।
ब्रह्म लब्ध्वा नैव किंचिल्लब्धव्यमवशिष्यते ॥
ब्रह्मज्ञानं ब्रह्मलाभ एकमेव द्विधोदितम् ।
ज्ञात्वा लब्ध्वाथवा ह्येतत् शान्तिमाप्नोति शाश्वतीम् ॥

---

[9] Compare my Introduction to the *Bhagavadgītā* with the *Ānandavardhinī*, pp. 18–21.

The first is with slight variation *Kena Upaniṣad* ii. 3, and the first half of the second is influenced by *Kena* ii. 4, and the second half by *BG* vii. 2. The last has not so far been traced; but it endorses the "*Anirvacanīya-vāda*" which has not been so outspokenly endorsed by the *Bhagavadgītā*.

—After ii. 7 are given the following three stanzas:

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा यस्य (? येऽस्य) हृदि स्थिताः ।
स भवत्यमृतो मर्त्यो ब्रह्म चात्र समश्नुते ॥
यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः ।
स भवत्यमृतो मर्त्य एतावदनुशासनम् ॥
भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥

These stanzas, with slight variations, are in order *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* ii. 3. 14, ii. 3. 15, and *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* ii. 2. 8. The stanzas endorse the doctrine of "*Sadyomukti*," which would go against the *BG* insistence upon the *Jñānin* following the ordinary *Vyavahāra* in a mood of equipoise.

—After iii. 40 of the current text we find:

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परं चेतः चेतसः सत्त्वमुत्तमम् ।
सत्त्वादथ महानात्मा महतोऽव्यक्तमुत्तमम् ॥
अव्यक्तात् तु परं ब्रह्म व्यापकं चाप्यलिङ्गकम् ।
यज्ज्ञात्वा मुच्यते जीवो ह्यमृतत्वं च गच्छति ॥

These stanzas correspond to *Kaṭha* ii. 3. 7-8, which give the well-known "*Ratha-rūpaka*" (already given in its simpler form in *Kaṭha* i. 3. 10), in a later and more technical form. The *BG* having already quoted the simpler form of the metaphor at the end of Chapter iii. would not again quote the other form.

—After iii. 41 of the current text we read:

इन्द्रियाणां पृथग्भावमुदयास्तमयौ च यौ ।
पृथगुत्पद्यमानानां ज्ञात्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥

The remarks made with reference to the previous quotation hold good more or less in this case also.

—After iv. 23 of the current text is quoted:

अहमन्नं सदान्नाद इति हि ब्रह्मवेदनम् ।
ब्रह्मविद् ग्रसति ग्रासात् (? ज्ञानात्) सर्वं ब्रह्मात्मनैव हि ॥

The first half of the above is equal to *Pāśupatabrahmopaniṣad* 38[cd], while the second half is 39[ab] of the same *Upaniṣad*. It is wide of the context. It is also doubtful if the *BG* would contain quotation from such a late tract.

—After iv. 41 of the current text is found:

यथा रविः सर्वरसान् प्रभुङ्क्ते
हुताशनश्चापि हि सर्वभक्षः ।
तथैव योगी विषयान् प्रभुङ्क्ते
न लिप्यते पुण्यपापैश्च शुद्धः ॥

This is stanza 6 of the *Avadhūta Upaniṣad*, in which the well-known stanza, "*Na nirodho na cotpattiḥ*" (cf. *Gauḍapādakārikā* ii. 32), is also found. The work is much too late for being quoted in the *Bhagavadgītā*.

—After vi. 28 the following two stanzas are inserted:

स ब्रह्मा स शिवः सेन्द्रः सोऽक्षरः परमः स्मृतः ।
स एव विष्णुः स प्राणः स कालाग्निः स चन्द्रमाः ॥
स एव सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भव्यं सनातनम् ।
ज्ञात्वा तं मृत्युमत्येति नान्यः पन्था विमुक्तये ॥

These, with slight variations, equal *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* i. 8-9. The *Upaniṣad* is old enough for being quoted in the *BG*, but is it not surprising that no indication of the quotation is found in all the available genuine MSS. and in the oldest available commentaries?

—After vi. 29, of the current text, first half, room is made for:

संपश्यन् ब्रह्म परमं याति नान्येन हेतुना ।

This is equal to *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* i. 14[cd], the *BG* having already quoted i. 10[ab] as *BG* vi. 29[ab]. If the

Gītā wanted to quote both the halves, it would not have composed a new half of its own with a separate verb "*īkṣate*", which remains, in the "*Bhojapatrī*" text, syntactically unconnected.

—After vi. 29 of the current text is quoted:

आत्मानमरणिं कृत्वा प्रणवं चोत्तरारणिम् ।
ज्ञाननिर्मथनाभ्यासात् पापं दहति पूरुषः ॥

which is equal to *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* i. 11.

—After vi. 30 of the current text:

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥

is quoted, which is equal to stanza 6 of the *Iśa Upaniṣad*,

—After vii. 23 of the current text the following half stanza is inserted just to complete the half stanza,

सिद्धान् यान्ति सिद्धव्रताः ।
भूतान् भूतयजो यान्ति ॥

already found in the Kashmirian recension:

यक्षान् विद्याधरान् यान्ति गन्धर्वास्तत्पराः ।

—After viii. 8 of the current text is found:

यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रे
गच्छन्त्यस्तं नामरूपे विहाय ।
तथा विद्वान् नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः
परात् परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् ॥

This, with slight variations, is *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* iii. 2. 8.

—After viii. 11 of the current text we find the following long citation from *Kena Upaniṣad* i. 4-8, and *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* i. 2. 16-17:

यच्च वाचा नाभ्युदितमभ्युद्यते च येन वाक् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥
मनुते यन्न मंनसा येनाहुर्मनो मतम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥

यच्चक्षुषा न पश्यति येन चक्षूंषि पश्यन्ति ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥
शृणोति यन्न श्रोत्रेण येन श्रोत्रमिदं श्रुतम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥
प्राणीति यन्न प्राणेन प्राणः प्राणीयते यतः ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥
एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म एतदेवामृतं परम् ।
एतदेवाव्ययं ज्ञात्वा यो यदिच्छेत् तदाप्नुयात् ॥
एतदालम्बनं श्रेष्ठमेतदालम्बनं परम् ।
एतदालम्बनं ज्ञात्वा प्राप्नोति परमां गतिम् ॥

At this rate space could have been found for any number of stanzas! The device is much too ingenuous to pass muster.

—After viii. 13 of the current text are cited the following:

तदेतदक्षरं ब्रह्म स प्राणो वाङ्मनश्च सः ।
तत् सत्यममृतं चैव तद्विद्धि भरतर्षभ ॥
प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तल्लक्ष्यमुच्यते ।
अप्रमत्तेन वेद्धव्यं शरवत् तन्मयो भवेत् ॥
धनुर्गृहीत्वैवमिदं महास्त्रं शरं ह्युपासानिशितं विधाय ।
आयम्य तद्भागवतेन धीरो लक्ष्यं तदेवाक्षरमित्यवैहि ॥

These correspond to *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* ii. 2. 2. 4, and 3 (in this order), and credit is due for the changes made into the original wording of the *Upaniṣad* to make them suit the *BG* context. Thus,

Tad veddhavyaṁ somya viddhi of the *Upaniṣad* becomes:
Tad viddhi Bharatarṣabha in the *Bhagavadgītā*;
Dhanur gṛhītvaupaniṣadaṃ of the *Upaniṣad* becomes:
Dhanur gṛhītvaivam idam in the *Bhagavadgītā*.

Noteworthy also is the alteration of
bhāvagatena cetasā into *Bhāgavatena dhīro*.

--After ix. 28 of the current text we read the next two stanzas, which are respectively *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* i. 6 and *Kaivalya* i. 7[ab] + 1.5[cd]:

अचिन्त्यमव्यक्तमनन्तरूपं
शिवं प्रशान्तममृतं ब्रह्मयोनिम् ।
तमादिमध्यान्तविहीनमेकं
विभुं चिदानन्दमरूपमद्भुतम् ॥
उमासहायं परमेश्वरं प्रभुं त्रिलोचनं नीलकण्ठं प्रशान्तम् ।
हृत्पुण्डरीके विरजं विशुद्धं संचिन्तयेद्ब्रह्मरूपं विशोकम् ॥

These stanzas can bear evidence to the devotion for God *Śiva* of some residents of Benares, but they do not fit in with the *Gītā* context.

—After xi. 31 of the current text we read:

नारायणोऽहं पुरुषः शिवोऽहं
ब्रह्माहमस्मि सकलोऽहमस्मि ।
पूर्णोऽहमीशश्च पुरातनोऽहं
हिरण्मयो ज्ञानरूपोऽहमस्मि ॥

Kaivalya stanza 20 is in some MSS read like this[10]; but as a reply to Arjuna's question it is not apposite.
—The extra initial stanza which opens *BG*, chapter xiii, is generally put in the mouth of Arjuna (with the reading *Etad veditum icchāmi* in the third *pāda*); but it is given here as Kṛṣṇa's own stanza, read as:

प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव क्षेत्रं क्षेत्रज्ञमेव च ।
एतत् ते कथयिष्यामि ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं च भारत ॥

—After xiii. 21 of the current text is given:

प्रशासितारं सर्वेषामणीयांसमणोरपि ।
रुक्माभं स्वप्नधीगम्यं जानीयात् पुरुषं परम् ॥

This is from the *Bhavasantaraṇa Upaniṣad* ii. 42, which is not even included in the *Muktika* Canon of 108 *Upaniṣads*.

—After xv. 4, of the current text is met:

संप्राप्यैतमृषयो ज्ञानतृप्ताः
कृतात्मानो वीतरागाः प्रशान्ताः ।

---

10 See उपनिषदां समुच्चयः in the *Anandashram Sanskrit Series*, p. 109, footnote.

ते सर्वगं सर्वतः प्राप्य धीरा
युक्तात्मानः सर्वमेवाविशन्ति ॥

which equals, with slight variation, *Muṇḍaka* iii. 2. 5.
—After xv. 5 is inserted :

वेदान्तविज्ञानविनिश्चितार्थाः
संन्यासयोगेन च शुद्धसत्त्वाः ।
ते ब्रह्मलोके च परान्तकाले
परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति दुःखात् ॥

This stanza is equal to *Muṇḍaka* iii. 2. 6 is equal to *Kaivalya* i. 3^{cd} + 1.4^{ab}
—After xv. 15 of the current text room is made for :

न पुण्यपापे मम नास्ति नाशो
न जन्मदेहेन्द्रियबुद्धिरस्ति ।
न भूमिरापो मम वह्निरस्ति
न चानिलो मेऽस्ति न चाम्बरं च ॥

The first half of the stanza equals *Kaivalya* ii. 3^{cd}, while the latter half equals *Kaivalya* ii. 4^{ab}. Immediately after the above stanza is inserted :

एवं विदित्वा परमात्मरूपं गुहाशयं निष्कलमद्वितीयम् ।
समस्तसाक्षिं सदसद्विहीनं प्रयाति शुद्धं परमात्मरूपम् ॥

the first half of which equals *Kaivalya* ii. 4^{cd}, and the second half, *Kaivalya* ii. 5^{ab}.

* * * *

Comment on an "original" *Bhagavadgītā* text concocted in the above fashion is quite superfluous. If this was the original *Gītā*, we have every right to ask why it had remained unknown to all the *Bhāṣyakāras* all these centuries. To me it seems obvious that the Gondal editor as well as (possibly) his Benares agent, Pandit Pancholi, have been the victims of a clever and unscrupulous deception, which it has become almost a sacred duty to expose. I am, however, willing to hear the arguments on the other side.

TWO SANSKRIT MEMORANDA OF 1787

By Mr. S. N. Sen

A masterful person was Warren Hastings. Intent on having his own way in everything he rode roughshod over all opposition reasonable or perverse. It is needless to say that he was not always right, nor did he receive impartial justice from contemporary critics in every instance. His autocratic methods, fully justified as they were by success, naturally made many enemies who thwarted in India, carried their propaganda at home to the greater prejudice of their powerful opponent's interest and Hastings found himself impeached for his alleged misdemeanours after his return to England. His strong rule however had won for him the goodwill and admiration of many Indians, and they hastened to testify to the great qualities of the illustrious pro-consul when the news reached this country. Four testimonials about Hastings's solicitude for the welfare of the Company's subjects came from Benares alone. The first of these bore two hundred and seventy-seven seals of the notables of the holy city including the Maharaja and attested to the uncommon prudence, rectitude, ability, understanding and courtesy of Hastings. This memorandum was evidently drawn up in Persian, the language of the elegant and the élite. The fourth memorandum was in Hindusthani written in Gujarati character and gave expression to the high esteem in which Hastings was held by the rich bankers of "the New Putty quarters" and the wealthy merchants of Benares. The second and the third testimonials are reproduced below. They bore numerous signatures and

referred in general terms to what Hastings had done to earn their gratitude.

Apart from their historical value these two documents have a special interest for us as they were composed in a language known only to the learned few. We do not propose to discuss here whether Sanskrit was ever a spoken language. That it served as a *lingua franca* for the people of India long after it had ceased to be a living language cannot be gainsaid. Hindu princes belonging to different parts of the country and speaking different vernaculars found in Sanskrit a suitable and convenient medium for diplomatic correspondence in the last decades of the seventeenth century and donatory grants and inscriptions still continued to be made in the language which seems to have gained in sanctity by lapse of time. These two memoranda go a long way to prove, if any proof is needed, that Sanskrit still served to furnish a linguistic bond among the Hindus of India.[1] The 178 signatories of one memorandum came from the distant provinces of Maharashtra and Gujarat and were officially described as "Paṇḍits of Maharashtra and Nāgara and other Brahmins at Benares." The 112 subscribers of the other testimonial are inaccurately alluded to as Bengal Paṇḍits. The names leave no doubt that all of them did not come from Bengal, nor was every one of these signatories a Brāhmin by caste and all the Brāhmins who came forward to record their evidence in Hastings's favour could not claim to be Sanskrit scholars. Mannu Vijhat, Rāmnath Vijhat and Ausan Misra are not Bengali names and probably belonged to the adjoining province of Bihar historically associated with the bigger and more important

[1] There are about a dozen Sanskrit letters dating from the late 18th to the early nineteenth century in the custody of the Imperial Record Department at New Delhi. Sanskrit as a medium of correspondence was not, therefore, completely abandoned until recently.

Suba. Kāshīnāth Maithila very likely hailed from the Darbhanga region. Bihari Charan Sil, Sant Singh, Vishwanath Ghosh, Ram Sundar Shahu, Krishnamohan Das and Ram Shankar Basu could not be Brahmins. They were indiscriminately grouped together as Bengali Pandits probably because they had all subscribed to a statement in Sanskrit, a language commonly confined to the priestly caste. While the memorialists from Maharashtra, Gujarat, Bihar and Bengal used as a common tongue they did not use a common script. The former wrote in Devanagari but the latter preferred the Bengali character with which they were more familiar. It is not unlikely that the Sils, Ghoshes and Basus were quite innocent of a script in which the learned alone revelled. It may be noted here that the original signatures have been lost and we have at present a list of signatories in Arabic letters appended to the Persian translation.

The residents and outsiders, settled at the holy city of *Viśweśwara*, naturally belonged to all stations of life. Some of them were humble pilgrims and unostentatious seekers of learning while a good few must have been men of wealth and influence. We find for instance the name of Jai Narayan Ghosal among the Bengalee memorialists. But rich and poor, learned and unlettered, scrupulously refrained from questions of high politics and referred only to those specific acts of the ex-Governor-General which were particularly calculated to benefit the pilgrims, *e.g.*, the suppression of the undue and illegal exactions of the *Gangaputras* or the officiating priests, the new facilities for the free and unhampered performance of their religious rites, the appointment of Ali Ibrahim Khan as Chief Magistrate of Benares, and last but not least the construction of a *naubat khana* or music gallery near the gateway of the *Viśweśwara* temple. This must have specially appealed to the average Hindu

as a particularly meritorious act. Hastings had the imagination of a real statesman and knew how to win the golden opinion of the man in the street. If he had deprived the holy city of its Hindu ruler he was not long in proving that neither the deity nor his devotees were out of his mind and their needs would always receive his earnest attention. His unchristian homage to a pagan god probably did the greatest credit to this christian ruler.

What proportion of the outsiders settled at Benares subscribed to these memorials is difficult to ascertain at this distance of time. The special sanctity of the holy city had from time immemorial attracted myriads of pilgrims from all parts of India. Benares, moreover, enjoyed the eminence of being the greatest seat of Sanskrit learning and thousands of ambitious students flocked there to seek the distinction which the city of *Viśweśwara* alone could confer. There must have been therefore a large floating population of pilgrims, professors and pupils of whom the 290 persons who made their written deposition must have formed an infinitesimal fraction. According to Prinsep, there were no less than 11,311 Maharashtra, 1,231 Nagara and 3,000 Bengali residents at Benares in 1828-29 or fifty years after the submission of the memorials and it is interesting to note that one thousand *gangaputras* ministered to the spiritual needs of 1,22,365 Hindus at that date.

It may be pertinently enquired whether these testimonies were really free and voluntary. It is to be noted that Ali Ibrahim Khan forwarded these four memorials to Mr. Jonathan Duncan "in order that he might in his kindness forward them to the Council at Calcutta and request in behalf of the inhabitants that the beneficent gentlemen of the Council having caused the addresses to be translated . . . would send both the originals and the

translations to the Presence of the Hon'ble Directors."[2] Mr. Duncan however was on his guard and refused to have anything to do with these documents as they had "no relation with the Business of the Company." The papers were thereupon sent to Hastings's attorney, Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson approached the Governor-General-in-Council with a request that he may be permitted to receive such written testimonies as the native inhabitants of the Company's territories may be willing to bear to the merits of Mr. Hastings and that the Judges, Collectors and residents under the Presidency may be requested to transmit any such testimony to the Governor-General-in-Council.[3] This request was complied with but the Company's servants were plainly warned that "the liberty now accorded is merely to receive and transmit testimonials when offered and you are not to deduce any inference from it that you are authorised to exercise any further interference in the business."[4] It is therefore clear that the Governor-General-in-Council were not prepared to countenance any undue zeal on the part of their officers in securing any testimony in Hastings's favour. They were simply to act as a post office when any memorial was voluntarily submitted. Mr. Duncan's attitude was one of rigid neutrality if not of rigid indifference.

Ali Ibrahim Khan on the contrary was a friend and protégé of Warren Hastings. It is not unikely that he might have exerted himself in securing these testimonials from the citizens of Benares. It is evident from his own letter that he did not share Mr. Duncan's indifference in this matter. As the Chief Magistrate of the city he had

[2] Ali Ibrahim Khan to Thompson, *Public Consultations*, 31 March, 1788, No. 14.

[3] Letter dated 2nd March, 1788.

[4] Circular letter from Mr. E. Hay. *Public Consultations*, 31 March, 1788, No. 16.

exceptional opportunities of bringing some pressure upon the grandees, bankers and residents of humbler status if he was so inclined and the glowing terms in which our memorialists refer to the unique qualities of the head and heart with which the Khan was richly endowed may lead an over-sophisticated reader to suspect that these documents were probably designed as much to flatter the magistrate as to exonerate the ex-Governor-General from unmerited aspersions. Jai Narain Ghoshal also might not have been absolutely uninterested in Hastings's fate though he figures rather low on the list. The memorialists however steered clear of controversial measures and questions of high policy; their testimony is strictly limited to facts within their own knowledge and there is no reason to suggest that it was not given of their free will because Ali Ibrahim Khan took a natural, if indiscreet, interest in the preparation and transmission of these documents.

The Pandits speak of the rare kindness which they received from Hastings during his second visit to Benares. A sincere patron of oriental learning Hastings must have received his learned guests with spontaneous courtesy which made a lasting impression on them and when the memorials were drafted the scholars of the South, West and East readily agreed to pay a special tribute to the charming manners of the Governor-General. It may, therefore, reasonably be concluded that the two documents quoted below truly reflect the genuine feeling of the signatories though the idea of bearing public testimony to Warren Hastings's character and achievements might have emanated from men of rank and wealth.

1. Copy of the Memorandum drawn up by the Maharashtra, Nagara and other Brahmins of Benares (written in Devanāgarī Character).

युग-कृत-धृति १८४४ तुल्ये विक्रमादब्द-वृंदे गतवति नवपू-

र्णाव्यष्टि १७०६ संख्ये शकाख्ये । अधिगुहतिथि ६ शुक्ले कार्त्तिके शुक्रवारे कृतमिदमिह पत्रं काशिकाख्यात-लोकैः वयं जना वाराणसी-वासिनः प्रवासिनश्चात्र संप्राप्ता याथातथ्येन ब्रूमः गवर्नर-जनरल-वारन-हिष्टिंस-साहेवाख्य-विभु-वर-कृपा-संभार-शिष्टाचार-कलित-कतिपय-कारणैः संतुष्टा हृष्टाश्च वर्त्तामह इति । तेषु च कारणेषु ॥ स निखिल-देशीय-चातुर्वर्ण्य-महत्तीर्थ-रुपायाः श्रीविश्वेश्वर-नगर्या वसति-स्वास्थ्य-निरूपणेय (*sic*) लंकृतवानिति प्रथमम् स-सुखं स-मानं चास्मान्स्वराज्ये स्थापितवानिति द्वितीयम् यात्रिणश्च गङ्गापुत्र-महोपद्रवभियाल्पतरा अत्रागछन्ति (*sic*) स्म तदुपद्रवानुपशमितवानित्यभूत-पूर्व-स्वकार्य-सौकर्यं विचार्य निरस्त-समस्त-साध्वसाः सकल-जनपद-यात्रिणः स्फिराः साम्प्रतं सुखं समायान्तीति तृतीयं वाराणस्यास्संरक्षणाय न्याय-निर्णयाय च सुज्ञ-न्यायविन्निर्लोभं नवात्र अली इब्राहीम खानं शास्तारं प्रतिष्ठापितवान् चातुर्वर्ण्य-विवाद-विवेचनाय वरीयांसो द्विज-विद्वांसस्तदितरतन्निर्णयाय च यवनास्ते तिष्ठेयुरिति देशस्थ-समस्त-जनानुरंजन-सुखाकरण-दृढ़तर-नियोगगर्भमाज्ञापत्रं तस्मायर्पितवान् स च शास्ता सर्वेषामधिकारिणामुत्कोच-दण्डाद्युपादान-प्रतिषेधेन राज-वलवंड (*sic*) सिंह-चेतसिंह-राज्यादधिकतरं प्रजाः सुखयतीति चतुर्थं पुनश्चात्र समागतः पीनयशा गवर्नर-मिस्तर-हिष्टीनोत्रत्य-शिष्टजन-समागम-समये साधु-मधुर-संलापापार-कृपासाराचाराचरणैर्यथायथ-सर्व-सम्मान-विधान-प्रतिपालन-परैर्वहिरन्तःकरणैः सर्व-जन-मनस्तोष्यतिस्मेति पंचमम् अस्मजनामन्दानन्द-सम्पादनाय सर्व-तीर्थ-शिरोमणि-श्रीमद्विश्वेश्वर-द्वारि स्ववसु-व्ययेन विशाल-वादित्रायतनं कारितवानिति षष्ठम् प्रजापालन-परिपाट्य-परित्यागे न सर्वथा लोभदष्ट्यसृष्ट्या कदापि कस्यचिदपि हानिं नेहितवानिति सप्तमम् इत्थं मिस्तर-हिष्टिंस जलादज्जंग-सुनीति-प्रीति-रीतय ऋतोदिताः पादशाह-कंपनी-यशांसि शारदेन्दुवन्निखिलाशा व्यापयन्तो हिंदोस्तानेति-प्रतीत-वितत-नीवृत्स, जाग्रतीति वयं समे सुखिता अकम्पानुकम्पानिधि-पादशाह-कम्पनी-प्राज्य-सौराज्य-साम्राज्य-समृद्धिमधिकतरमाशास्महे इति शिवम् ॥ ॥

Names of the Signatories (in Persian).

Nilkanth Bhutt; Bireshwar Sish; Atma Ram Kay; Balam Bhut Koley; Bhairav Dixit; Megh Nath Deo; Shambhu Deo; Jairam Bhutt; Jagannath Bhutt Shukul; Baijnath Bhutt; Jagannath Misr; Ganga Ram Karikal; Ramchandra Bhutta Kootkar (Ketkar?); Atma Ram Puranik; Bhutt Ganga Ram; Somnath Bhutt Neoyatkar; Bhudeo Misr; Bhairav Dixit; Balam Bhutt Bharadwaj; Guneshwar Bhutt; Baba Dixit; Balkrishen Dixit Mahaji; Dadam Bhutt; Kishen Bhutt Arari; Sukha Ram Bhutt; Jogeshwar Bhutt; Harikishen Dixit; Babu Dixit Ayachuk; Ramkishen Tepathi; Udaya Shankar Pandit; Anna Shastri; Shadasheo Bhutt; Balmakund Bhutt Kholi; Balkishen Dixit; Sita Ram Bhatt Puranik; Pandit Nana Panhik; Balkishen Karikal; Mauni Ram Bhutt Sadaharti; Baijnath Bhutt Nagraj; Prem Shankar; Anand Ram Bhutt Lachmi Dhar; Sambhuji Dixit; Udaya-kishen Tewari; Lachmidhar Dixit; Lachman Vyas; Ballabh Ji; Sheovallabh Ji Gopal Ji; Jaikishen Pathak; Anand Ram Anant Ram; Meanath Panda; Sadakishen Janey; Panda Nand Ram; Mukund Ram Shukal; Kalyan-ji Dixit; Moolnath Rooderji; Dubey Kewal Kishen; Sheo Paran Jeewan; Tewari Bhishen Deo; Tewarı Kanaya Deo; Bawan Kishen; Dubey Ganpat Ji; Dubey Bishnoo Ram; Suraj Kishen; Tewari Kishen Ballabh; Pura Ganga Ram; Pura Bishnu Ram; Pandia Kalyanji; Tiwari Motilal; Dubey Kanaya Ji; Anand Ram Shukal; Ram Dutt; Kewal Kishen Dixit; Dina Nath; Ram Kishen Bhut Kholey; Anant Ram Bhutt; Maladhar Dharam Adhikari; Balmakund Arori; Hari Bhutt Dhobey; Vasudeo Bhutt Gurjar; Sheoram Bhutt Jhosi; Jagannath Dharamdhikari: Anant Ram Bhutt; Vinayak Bhutt Moni; Kirpa Krishn Jakak; Shew Lal Pathak; Lachman Bhutt; Babroopajh (*sic*) Shastri; Bhawani Shankar Thakur; Jogeshwar Shastri; Megha Pat Joshi;

Ganesh Bhutt Sharangpani; Sheobhadra Pathak; Surajram Jani; Arat Ram Vallabh Ram; Gobind Ram Sheo Dutt; Beni Ram Bora; Singhji Mureshẇar; Mohan Lal Murlidhar; Dubey Chiranjiwa Shashankar (Shiva Shankar?); Dewa Karan Bakht Ram; Gori Shankar Varachand; Nanak Parmeshwar; Kamla Karan Ajleshwar (*sic*); Dubey Banath (*sic*) Ram; Rameshwar Bakran; Kashi Ram Rateshwar; Rati Ram Sanmukhram; Vidyadhar Udaykaran; Dubey Izzut Ram Lajja Ram; Daya Dhar Dina Nath; Dayanath Bishnu; Gotha Sathvāk Krishna Kayal; Varadhar Mangleshwar; Rewa Das; Jeevaneshwar; Amba Shankar Bijoy Shankar; Liladhar Rup Ram; Kāshi Ram Sheo Shankar; Jani Rewa Dutt Behari Lal; Suraj Ram Munna Ram; Nana Mokha; Govind Ram Nir Baneshwar; Ishwarji Lukhooji; Jain Anand Ram Sarth Ram; Jagat Ram Izzat Ram; Mukeshwar; Rashik Lal Brijlal; Dayanand Karnakaran; Ram Dutt Sawakeshwar (Sevakeshwar); Sanmookh Ram Uttam Ram; Surga Shankar Daya Ram; Bajji Ram Charan Ram; Balmokund Shankar; Chandreshwar; Hirakaran Moti Karan; Bishunath Chagopi Nath (Visvanath Jhā?); Jiteshwar Lachmi Ishwar; Prem Shankar; Mahant Gopal Kishen; Amba Ram Vyas; Krishnji Joshi; Ram Chandra Vyas; Mawari Mal Sheshwar (Shiveshwar); Dubey Suraja Ji; Tewari Ratan Ji; Tewari Amba Ram; Ganpat Joshi; Jadupat Joshi; Pandia Mahadeo; Bidya Dhar Vaid; Raja Ram Kanwal Ram; Dev Dutt Bhutt; Vidya Nund Joshi; Bibareshwar; Battha Ram Bhutt; Ojha Ram Kishen; Tiwari Baijnath; Dubey Chaturbhuj; Dubey Deo Ram; Ojha Radha Kishen; Amba Shankar Jali; Ananda Ram Vyas; Munna Ram; Raghunath Gopal; Dixit Gopalji; Dixit Hari Kishen; Suraj Lal Shukul; Jiwan Ram Dube; Krishan Deo Dixit; Gopal Deo; Chitreshwar Bhat; Parbhu Deo Vyas; Sheo Shankar Dixit; Narain Deo; Kirpa Shankar Dixit; Gokul Nath Dixit.

2. Copy of the Memorandum drawn up by Bengali Brahmins and other Hindus, inhabitants of Benares (written in Bengali Character).

श्रीमत्सु राज-राजेषु इंलेएड-भूमिन्द्रेषु (*sic*) श्रीमत्-कोम्पा-
नौच श्रीवाराणस्यां कृत-वसतीनां नानादेशीया यात्रि-
कानाञ्च निवेदनानि विशेषः श्रीयुत-गवर्न्नर-जर्न्नें (*sic*)-
ल-हेस्तिंस-नरेन्द्रस्य प्रणयानुरागा-(*sic*)-समनुरञ्जिता एव नि-
त्यं तिष्ठामः ।१। अपरोपि अस्मिन् देशे यदा तेन नरेन्द्रे-
ण स्थितं तदा आस्माकं मङ्गलार्थं मर्य्यादा-स्थापनार्थञ्च ब-
हुधा प्रयतितं ॥ २ ॥ अपरोपि तस्य नरेन्द्रस्य प्रसादान्नि-
रुद्वेगमत्रवसतामस्माकमतीवसुखं दुष्टानां दमनाद्च (*sic*) श्रु-
त्वा नानादिग्भ्यो लोकाः समागत्यात्र वसतिञ्चक्रुः ॥ ३ ॥
अन्योपि अत्रवसतां सतां प्रतिपालनार्थमसतां निग्रहार्थ-
ञ्च धीमन्तं नानाशास्त्रार्थ-कोविदंधर्म्मभीरु-निर्लोभं वेद-प-
थानुसारिणां धर्म्म-शास्त्रानुसारेण यवनानां तदीय शास्त्रानु-
सारेण च व्यवस्थापकं नियोजयितुं (*sic*) पर्य्यालोच्य श्रीमान हेस्ति-
न-संज्ञो नरेन्द्रस्तादृशं श्रीमन्नवाब अलीबिराहिम खाँ-नामकं-
गुन-सिन्धुं नियोजयामास तेन पूर्व्व-राज्ञापेक्षया इदानीमस्मा-
कं सम्यक्-प्रतिपालनं जायते ॥ ४ ॥ अपरोपि यदात्र-नरे-
न्द्रेणागतं तदा तं द्रष्टुं ये ये गताः ते ते यथायोग्यमादृताः ॥ ५ ॥
अन्योपि यथायोग्य-श्रीश्री ँ प्रीत्या नित्य-विजयार्थं श्रीश्री ँ तोरण-
समीपे प्रभूत-मुद्रा-व्ययेन सम्यङ्निर्म्मिते पाषाण-मये प्रासादे
वादित्रं नैत्यिकं नरेन्द्रः कारयामास ॥ ६ ॥ तेन नरेन्द्रेण
यावदत्र स्थितं तावदेव पुत्रवद्वयं सर्व्वथा प्रतिपालिता अस्मा (*sic*)
अस्माकं कस्मिन्नपि विषये तस्य नरेन्द्रस्य न्युनता नासीत् ॥ ७ ॥
तेन वयं सर्व्वदा सुखिनस्तिष्ठामः । एतेन श्रीमतां राजराजा-
नां इङ्लेएड़-भूमिन्द्राणां (*sic*) दीननाथैकशरणानां श्रीमतः को-
म्पानेश्चात्र महती कीर्त्तिर्जाता वर्त्तते वयमपि नित्यं शुभाशि-
षः कुर्म्मः । श्री ँ वासिनां निवेदनमिति ॥ ॥

Names of the Signatories (*in Persian*).

Kriparam Tarka-Siddhānta; Gvindaram Nyāyachārya; Ramarama Siddhanta; Kashiram Chatterji; Pran Krishna Sharma; Shyam Vidyavagish; Krishnamangal Sharma; Krishna Chandra Sarvabhauma; Yugal Kishor

Vandopadhyaya; Krishna Chandra Mukherji; Ramlochan Mukherji; Dulal Nyayalankar; Balaram Vachaspati; Sadananda Tarka Vagish; Sivnath Tarkabhushan; Ananda Chandra Bhattacharya; Ramcharan Vidyavagish; Kashinath Maithil; Gangaram Vyas; Ram Prasad Bandyopadhyaya; Ramsundar Ray; Vagaleshvar Pahan (Pradhan ?); Kaliprasad Bhattacharya; Gangadhar Vidyavagish; Krishnananda Vidyalankar; Ramcharan Chakravarti; Haridev Tarkabhushan; Ramchandra Vidyalankar; Ramram Bakshi; Balaram Bhattacharya; Rudraram Sarkar; Bhavanicharan Sarkar; Ramshankar Vandyopadhaya; Sivaprasad Vachaspati; Kaliprasad Siddhanta; Sivnarayan Vandyopadhyay; Darpanarayan Bhattacharya; Gokul Krishna Vidyalankar; Ramkanta Vidyalankar; Ramnath Sharma; Chandicharan Sharma; Lakshman Vidyavagish; Ramkanta Vidyalankar; Gangaram Pahan (Pradhan ?); Lakshminarayan Sharma; Krishnananda Sarvabhauma; Khelaram Sharma; Tilak Chandra Gangopadhyay; Ramram Sharma; Ramji (van ?) Gangopadhyay; Kaliprasad Sharma; Jaganmohan Mukhopadhyay; Shobhanath Sharma; Ramdas Sharma; Krishndas Sarvabhauma; Jaykrishna Sharma; Jayashankar Sharma; Premananda Gangopadhyay; Janananda Sharma; Shambhunath Vandyopadhyay; Jayanarayan Ghoshal; Bhavanishankar Ghoshal; Gangahari Vandyopadhyay; Ramsantosh Chatterji; Vishvanath Chatterji; Ramram Siddhanta; Jagnnath Ray; Manikchandra Sharma; Gangadhar Vidyavagish; Rammohan Bhattacharya; Ramchandra Nyayalankar; Jaydev Sharma; Jagannath Sharma: Kashinath Sharma; Devnarayan Sharma; Gopalshankar Pahan (Pradhan ?); Lakshminarayan Nyayavagish; Krishnadev Chatterji; Yugalmohan Sharma; Vishvanath Ghosh; Raghunat Palat (Palit ?); Kaliprasad Sarkar; Viharicharan Sil; Santa Singh; Ramnarayan Sil; Ramsundar Sayin; Rammohan

Palat (Palit?); Prankrishna Palat (Palit?); Krishnamohan Das; Ramshankar Bose; Ramhari Das; Ramnidhi Das; Haricharan Malik; Vrajakishor Ghosh; Kaliprasad Sharma; Kalishankar Sharma; Kaliprasad Sharma; Kevalram Sharma; Kevalram Bhattacharya; Prannath Thakur; Ramchandra Banerji; Nilmani Thakur; Chaitanyacharan Thakur; Harikrishna Ved; Vishnushankar Vijhat; Mannu Vijhat; Ramnath Vijhat; Visvanath Mitra; Vaidyanath Narayan Misra; Ausan Misra; Kalidas Siddhanta.

English Translation of the First Memorandum

This memorandum is drawn up on (this day, being) Friday, the Sixth *tithi*[5] (lit. *tithi* presided over by Kārttikeya) from the new moon in (the month of) Kārttika, in the 1844th[6] year of Vikrama (equivalent to) the Śaka year 1709. We, the inhabitants as well as outsiders settled at Benares (literally, people coming from elsewhere) do (hereby) declare with truth and sincerity that we feel happy and satisfied on account of several (good) things originating from the generous and enlightened policy (administration) of the illustrious noble Mr. Hastings, the Governor-General. Among these things the first (to be mentioned) is the pain he took to populate as well as to promote the well-being of the City of *Viśveśvara*,[7] the most holy place for all the four castes belonging to the entire country.

---

5 '*Adhi-Guhatithi.*'—*Tithi* presided over by Guha (Kārttikeya).

6 '*Yugakṛta.*'—Twice four or four followed by four. *Dhṛti* =18 according to *Vācaspatyābhidhānam*. The year is therefore 1844. The date corresponds to 16th November, 1787.

7 Hastings framed a number of regulations for the improvement of the administration, trade and commerce of Benares and he wrote in a letter to Wheler "I have the happiness to find all men satisfied and happy in the excellent administration of Benares." Forrest, *Selections from State Papers*, Vol. III, pp. 816-17, 1095, 1117 and 1119.

Secondly, he has settled us under his jurisdiction with both honour and happiness.

Thirdly, frightened by the high-handedness of the *Gaṅgāputras*[8] few pilgrims previously use to visit this city. But now that those misdeeds have been suppressed and all other obstructions removed pilgrims are pouring in the city in large numbers from all provinces in view of the unprecedented facilities afforded for their religious rites.[9]

Fourthly. He appointed as Magistrate Nawab 'Ali Ibrahim *Khan*,[10] efficient, upright and well-versed in law, for the maintenance of law and order and administration of justice in the City of Benares. In the *proclamation*[11] of his appointment—an appointment justified by the resulting happiness and comfort that have accrued to the whole population of the locality, it was ordained that Brahmin Scholars should be appointed for deciding the suits preferred by the four castes and Muslim divines for (deciding) those preferred by others.[12] The said Magis-

[8] *Gaṅgāputra.*—According to V. S. Apte, "a Brāhmaṇa who conducts pilgrims to the Ganges." From the English translation of the Persian Letters Received (1788, Vol. 28, p. 57) it appears that the term used to be applied to the officiating priests in general. In Bengal the *Doms* in charge of the cremation grounds on the banks of the Ganges are also styled as *Gaṅgāputras*.

[9] In his letter to Wheler, already referred to, Hastings opined that the pilgrims should be encouraged in every way. In 1781 he abolished the pilgrim-tax and framed a few regulations to protect them "against every means of oppression." Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 1117. Also see *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*; Vol. VI, pp. 535 and 808.

[10] Ali Ibrahim Khan served under Alivardi Khan and Mir Qasim with distinction. He was appointed Chief Magistrate of Benares in 1781 and held that office till his death in 1793. Hastings thought very highly of his character and ability and alluded to the Chief Magistrate's "Character for moderation, disinterestedness and good sense" in a note to the Council. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 816.

[11] See Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 316 and *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, Vol. VI, 292.

trate having efficiently checked the exactions of bribes and (undue) fines by his subordinate officers has conferred on the people more happiness than enjoyed by them even under the rule of Rājā Balavanta Siṁha and Cheta Siṁha.[13]

Fifthly. On the occasion of an assemblage of the enlightened people of the locality which took place during the 2nd visit[14] of the illustrious governor Mr. Hastings, he charmed everybody by his elegant and delightful conversation, by his conduct characterised by unfathomable charity and by his deeds and thoughts which were solely devoted to rewarding and patronising the people according to their merits.

Sixthly. To our great delight, he caused a *music gallery* to be built at his own expense at the gateway of the illustrious *Viśveśvara* temple, the crest-jewel of all the holy places.

Seventhly. He never deviated from the principles essential to good government nor cast a look of greed (towards anybody) nor did he ever wish any ill to anybody.

Thus, do we truthfully testify to the wise and charitable policy followed by Mr. Hastings, Jaladat Jang

---

[12] The relevant part of the proclamation is as follows: "In all cases which shall depend on the particular laws and institutions of the parties, the said President and Judges shall . . . adjudge the right as established by those facts according to the respective laws and institutions of the parties, whether they be Mussalmen or Hindus and for this purpose they shall be assisted by two Maulvis versed in the Sheriat . . . and two Pundits versed in the Pootee of justice." Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 817; *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, Vol. VI, p. 292.

[13] Balavant Singh, Raja of Benares, 1739 to 1770, was succeeded by his son Chet Singh who was deposed by Hastings in 1781.

[14] Hastings visited Benares on the 13th March, 1784, on his way to Lucknow. During the return journey he spent about a month (13th September to 22nd October) at the holy city. *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, Vol. VI, pp. 985, 992, 998 and 1421.

(brave in war) The fame of the (English) King and the Company, pervading as it does all the quarters like autumn moonlight, is ever alive through the length and breadth of (their) far-flung and firmly established empire. And we all who are living in comfort, offer our prayers for the prosperity of the extensive and well-administered empire of the King and the Company, who are a veritable repository of never-failing kindness.

English Translation of the Second Memorandum.

This is the submission of people settled in Benares as well as of pilgrims from various provinces to the prosperous King of Kings, the King of England and the prosperous Company. We are living here richly blessed by the favour and patronage of the illustrious Governor-General and chief among men, Hastings (1). Secondly, as long as the said ruler resided in this country, he endeavoured in many ways for the promotion of our well-being and for the maintenance of our honour (2). Again, people came from all quarters and settled here when they learnt of the great happiness of us, who reside here in security, thanks to that ruler's (Mr. Hasting's) favour and of the suppression of the evil-doers (3). Further, having considered the propriety of appointing a magistrate who is intelligent, well-versed in all the sciences, god-fearing, devoid of greed and competent to adjust the cause between the followers of the Vedic religion according to the Dharma-Śāstras and between the Muslims in conformity with their laws, for the protection of the honest and the chastisement of the dishonest, the illustrious ruler, who is known by the name of Hastings, gave the appointment to the illustrious Nawb Ali Ibrahim Khan, who fulfilled all these requirements and was a veritable ocean of virtues, in consequence whereof, we are being governed much better than under the former Raja (4). Further,

when the said ruler came to this City, all who went to see him were received with respect according to their ranks. (5). Further, in order to obtain eternal prosperity in a fitting manner through the grace of the Supreme Lord, the said ruler provided for daily (play of) music in an elegantly fashioned stone edifice built for the purpose at considerable expense near the gate of the Lord's temple (6). So long as he resided in this country he cherished us in every way like his children. In no respect did he cause us any loss. We are on that account ever living in happiness. By these (deeds) the prosperous King of Kings, the King of England, the protector and sole refuge of the poor as well as the Company have gained great reputation. We are also daily offering our blessings. This is the submission of the inhabitants of the holy city.

BHĀSKARA'S VIEW OF ERROR

By Prof. M. Hiriyanna.

Like other old exponents of Vedānta, Bhāskara also commented upon the *Vedānta-Sūtra*, the *Upaniṣads*[1] and the *Bhagavadgītā*.[2] Of them, it is only the *Bhāṣya* on the first that is at present available in a rather imperfect edition.[3] Since throughout this work, he finds fault with Śaṅkara for his interpretation of the *Vedānta-Sūtra*, and since he himself is, in turn, criticised by Vācaspati, it is not difficult to fix his date fairly definitely. If we take for granted the dates now generally assigned to Śaṅkara (800 A.D.) and Vācaspati (850 A.D.), we may conclude that Bhāskara should have flourished in the early part of the 9th century A.D. The type of Vedānta taught by him is a very old one. It is described as *Brahma-pariṇāma-vāda*, and references to it are found in the *Vedānta-Sūtra* itself.[4] It maintains that the relation between *Brahman* and the *Jīva* or the physical universe is one of identity in difference, and is therefore also designated as the *Bhedābheda-vāda*. It was once largely prevalent in India; and may, broadly speaking, be regarded as Hegelian in its spirit. Śaṅkara criticised it often and severely; and it was chiefly owing to his criticism that it completely lost the hold which it seems,

---

[1] For example, Bhāskara alludes to his com. on *Chandogya Upaniṣad* on pp. 155 and 240 o his Bhāsya on the *Vedānta-Sūtra* (hereafter referred to as BB.).

[2] See *Indian Historical Quarterly* for 1933, pp. 663—77 for an article on this commentary by Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Śarma. Only fragments of it seem to be available now.

[3] Issued from the Chowkhamba Press, Benares 1915.

[4] Cf. I. iv. 20-21.

till then, to have had on the Indian mind. Efforts were made later to resuscitate it by thinkers like Bhāskara and Yādava-Prakāśa; but they did not succeed. There are, at least, two forms of this type of Vedānta, with differences in matters of detail; but, as they are not familiarly known,[5] it is desirable to state here the salient features of the particular variety of it taught by Bhāskara, before we can deal with his explanation of error.

Bhāskara is a monist like Śaṅkara, and holds that *Brahman* is the sole reality; but his conception of it is vastly different. He believes that *Brahman* is endowed with infinite potency, which he classifies under the two heads of *bhogya-śakti* and *bhoktṛ-śakti*.[6] The former manifests itself as the objective world; and, as a consequence of such manifestation, the other aspect of *Brahman* becomes split up into an indefinite number of parts. These self-differentiated parts or *aṁśas*,[7] as they are termed, are the *jīvas*. The physical world is thus an actual transformation or *pariṇāma* of *Brahman*, and not merely its appearance as in Śaṅkara's *Advaita*. The *jīva*, on the other hand, is a determination of *Brahman* formed by its own evolutes on the physical side, such as the internal organ (*antaḥ-karaṇa*) and the physical body It is the multiplicity of these adjuncts (*upādhi*) that accounts for the multiplicity of the *jīvas*. What should be particularly noted here is that the *jīva* is not a *pariṇāma* of *Brahman*,[8] as it is according to some other teachers of the *Bhedābheda* school like Bhartṛprapañca and Yādava, but an *aupādhika* or

---

[5] An excellent summary of Bhāskara's doctrine is found in Prof. P. N. Srinivasacharya's book, *The Philosophy of Bhedābheda* (Srinivasa Varadachari and Co., Madras).

[6] BB., pp. 85 and 105.

[7] BB., pp. 112 and 140-41.

[8] BB., p. 134.

conditioned state of it. It is only the result of *Brahman* being delimited by certain adjuncts that are its own transformations. The adjuncts being real, the limitation characterising the *jīvas* also is real; and in this lies the chief distinction between the view of Bhāskara and that of Śaṅkara. In its transmigrating state, the *jīva* forgets that it is intrinsically the unconditioned *Brahman* itself, and imagines that its limited character is natural (*svābhāvika*) to it. This is the root-cause of *saṁsāra;* and escape from it is possible only when it realises the true nature of those adjuncts and of itself. Except for the important distinction in the conception of *Brahman*, already mentioned, Bhāskara's view of *mokṣa* is the same as that of Saṅkara. In both the views, the *jīva* loses its individuality and gets merged in *Brahman.*[9] This is Bhāskara's idea of the triple subject-matter of philosophy, *viz.*, God, soul and matter.

Ignorance of its own true character then is the source of the *jīva's* bondage in this doctrine, as in so many others. This ignorance has two aspects.[10] There is a negative one (*agrahaṇa*) on account of which the *jīva* loses sight of its infinite nature; and there is a positive side (*viparīta-grahaṇa*) also, owing to which it comes to look upon itself as finite. The latter gives rise to a feeling of separateness from others; and, as a necessary consequence of it, follow all forms of evil like narrow love and hate. Here the error consists not in the *jīva's* sense of relationship with adjuncts like the body and the internal organ; for that relationship is conceived as actual, but in regarding it as essential (*svābhāvika*) while it is only adventitious (*aupādhika*). Thus the *jīva* is under a delusion only in so far as it takes what is provisional for

[9] BB., p. 231.

[10] BB., p. 19.

what is permanent. The dispelling of this error is possible, according to Bhāskara, through scriptural testimony. But, though wrong knowledge is removable in this life, actual release from the limiting conditions does not ensue until death, for an adventitious feature, as is well known, does not disappear until the element advening itself is removed. A person suffering from fever may know that sugar is sweet, but it continues to taste bitter as long as he has a bilious tongue. In the present case the adjuncts, which are instrumental in giving rise to the notion of limitation, persist till death when, in the case of a knower, they once for all cease to be.[11]

In the above error, the fact that two things, *viz.*, the self and the adjunct, are involved is well realised; and yet there is error. It consists in misconceiving the nature of the relation between them. There is another and a more radical form of error, in whch this fact is wholly overlooked; and the two things are, as a consequence, mistaken for one as a person looking at two trees in the dusk may mistake them for one. The self and the not-self thus come to be identified as shown by convictions like 'I am *Devadatta*' (understood in the Cārvāka sense).[12] Here what is strictly denoted by the term '*Devadatta*' is the physical organism; and the conviction implies the complete ignoring of spirit which is the true significance of the 'I'. That is, the condition (*upādhi*) is here mistaken for the conditioned (*upahita*); but both, we must remember, are in this doctrine equally real. The dispelling of the error consists in realising, on the strength of scriptural teaching, this fact, *viz* , that

---

[11] It is worth noting, in this connection, that Bhāskara does not accept the possibility of *jīvanmukti* or freedom while one is still alive. See BB., p. 220.

[12] Bhāskara refers to this as the primal error in several places in his commentary on the *Vedānta-Sūtra*. Cf., pp 21 and 219.

there are two factors and not merely one. Being real, the physical body will of course continue to be; but it will no longer be identified with the self.

So far, we have dealt with metaphysical error or the error which is the source of *saṁsāra*, as explained by Bhāskara. It is *anyathā-khyāti*;[13] and it is so described because it explains error as presenting its object in a manner which is different from what it actually is. This error, in its double form, will help us to understand his view of common error, which also is twofold. Instances of such error are cited by him as illustrations, but there is no direct treatment of the topic in his *Bhāṣya*. To get at his view, we have consequently to piece together the information available in it, and in a few of the works belonging to the other schools of Indian thought:

(1) Let us take as an example of the first variety of common error a white crystal which looks red, because a red flower is placed by its side. Here, according to Bhāskara, the redness of the crystal is real so long as it characterises it,[14] and not merely apparent as some other thinkers hold. But if any person, through ignorance, took that feature to be natural to the crystal, he would be in the wrong for it is purely adventitious, being caused by the presence of an *upādhi*, *viz.*, the red flower. There may, of course, be other contributory causes also, such as, a defect in one or more of the aids to proper visual perception (*karaṇa-doṣa*); but it is the presence of the flower that gives the error its distinguishing character. It is accordingly an example of what is known as *sopādhika-bhrama*. The knowledge that the crystal is actually white (*bādhaka-pratyaya*) obtained, for instance, by advancing

---

[13] Cf. *Iṣṭa-siddhi*, i. 42 where, according to the commentator, the view of error considered is Bhāskara's. See also *Prakaṭārtha-vivaraṇa*, p. 660.

[14] BB., pp. 139 and 210.

towards it, dispels the error. But, as in the parallel case under metaphysical error, the actual disappearance of the red colour depends on the removal of the flower itself. Till then, though the truth may be known, the appearance of redness in the flower persists; but it no longer misleads the person in question. The only difference is that the correcting knowledge can here be gained through one or other of the common *pramāṇas*, and does not require the aid of revelation. The removal of the *upādhi* again is possible in this case, here and now, for it is not permanent[15] as in the other.

(2) As an example of the second variety of common error, we shall select the mistaking of a piece of shell for silver. But before we can explain it, it is necessary to refer to a fundamental principle of Bhāskara's epistemology, *viz.*, that the non-existent, say, a unicorn or a square-circle can never make itself known. Since he recognises no being intermediate between *sat* and *asat*, as Śaṅkara's *Advaita* does, he views whatever is experienced as necessarily real.[16] Its being may be only provisional or temporal; but that does not conflict with its reality as conceived here. That is to say, *bādha* or contradiction does not signify the falsity of a thing, as it does in many other doctrines. In fact, Bhāskara contends that the idea of *bādha* is intelligible only in the case of the real which can be known, and not in that of the unreal which cannot be known.[17] We would say that there is no need to deny the unreal. In the above example, the silver should be real on this principle, for it is distinctly ap-

[15] The physical body is not strictly a permanent adjunct of the *jīva*, for it lasts only during this life. Put, according to the doctrine of *karma*, it is replaced by another then, so that the body as such may be regarded to be so. The *antaḥkaraṇa*, on the other hand, endures until the *jīva* is liberated.

[16] BB., pp 67 and 95.

[17] Cf. *Iṣṭa-siddhi*, i. 42.

F. 5

prehended. But it may be asked how it comes to be there. Bhāskara holds that the silver springs up, for the time being, where the piece of shell is. It may be difficult to conceive how it can do so, but that such was his view is not only implied by what he says in the *Bhāsya;*[18] it is also explicitly stated in some works of the other schools which refer to this point. Thus the *Dvaita* commentator Jaya-Tīrtha says: *Tatraiva tātkālikam-utpannam (rajatam) saditi Bhāskaraḥ.*[19] Now this error corresponds to that of 'I am *Devadatta*,' considered under metaphysical error; and its explanation is similar. One thing is mistaken for another, and the mistake disappears when it is known, say, that it is too light to be silver. An important distinction from the corresponding form of metaphysical error is that right knowledge not only removes error but also its object, *viz.*, silver. But it should not be forgotten that, according to the principle above enunciated, this knowledge points only its impermanence and not to its falsity:

It must be confessed that there is some indefiniteness in our account of this variety of common error. It is due to the fact, already mentioned, that there is no separate treatment of it in the only work of Bhāskara now available. We referred above to the difficulty in understanding how silver can come into being, albeit for a time only, where the shell is. Another point requiring elucidation is why, if the silver is real as it is claimed to be, it is perceived only by the victim of the error and not by others. The only explanation conceivable is that Bhāskara regarded it as what is called a 'private' object and not a 'public' one, some of the causes giving rise to it

---

[18] P. 93.

[19] *Pramāṇa-paddhati*, p. 68 (Edn. with eight commentaries). See also *Laghu-candrikā* on the *Advaita-siddhi*, pp. 32-3 (Nirn. Sag. Edn.).

(say, weakness of sight) being special to the person in question. A thing's being 'private,' it may be added, does not take away from its reality. Our pains and pleasures are personal to each one of us, but they are not the less real on that account. This explanation gets support from what he says of dream-objects, *viz.*, that they are the creations of the dreaming *jīva* and not of God.[20] There is, however, no direct evidence pointing to its correctness.

But whatever may be the solution of such difficulties one thing is clear, *viz.*, the persistence with which Bhāskara tries to uphold the realist position. He does not, indeed, go so far as Prabhākara does and deny error altogether. He admits it; but he still maintains that it invariably points to a *real* object, though that object may be false when viewed from a particular standpoint. To confine our attention to the examples of common error given above: The 'redness' of the crystal is real, and it is false only when taken as natural and not as adventitious to it. Similarly, in the case of the 'silver' also. It is quite real; but it is there for the time being, and would be false only if viewed as what was originally given.

---

[20] BB., p. 161. If this be Bhāskara's view, he would not be alone in holding it. Though there are differences in minor points, Rāmānuja also held that dream-objects and the objects of certain other forms of error are private. See *Proceedings of the Indian Philosophical Congress* (1925), pp. 79-80.

THE CAMPŪ

BY DR. S. K. DE.

Though the term *Campū* is of obscure origin, it is already used by *Daṇḍin* in his *Kāvyādarśa* (i. 31) to denote a species of composition in mixed verse and prose (*gadya-padyamayī*). Nothing, however, is said by *Daṇḍin*, or by any other rhetorician, about the relative proportion of verse and prose; but since the Prose *Kāvya*.(*Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā*), which makes prose its exclusive medium, also makes limited use of verse, it has been presumed that the mingling of prose and verse in the *Campū* should not occur disproportionately. In actual practice, the question, in the absence of authoritative prescription, seems never to have worried the authors, who employ prose and verse indifferently for the same purpose. The verse is not always specially reserved, as one would expect, for an important idea, a poetic description, an impressive speech, a pointed moral, or a sentimental outburst, but we find that even for ordinary narrative and description verse is as much pressed into service as prose. In this respect, the *Campū* scarcely follows a fixed principle; and its formlessness, or rather disregard of a strict form, shows that the *Campū* developed quite naturally, but haphazardly, out of the Prose *Kāvya* itself,[1] the impetus being supplied by the obvious desire of diversifying the prose form freely by verse as an additional ornament under the stress or the lure of the metrical *Kāvya*. In the *Campū*, therefore, the verse becomes as important a medium as the prose, with the

[1] The line of demarcation between a *Kathā* and *Campū* is so thin that Soḍḍhala's *Udayasundarī-Kathā* is sometimes regarded as a *Campū*. The presence of short prose does not distinguish a *Campū* from an ordinary *Kāvya*; witness, for instance, the *Svāhā-Sudhākara* of Nārāyaṇa mentioned below.

result that we find a tendency, similar to that of the decadent drama, of verse gradually ousting prose from its legitimate employment. Although *Daṇḍin* is aware of this type of composition, we possess no specimen of the *Campū* earlier than the 10th century A.D. Its late appearance, as well as its obvious relation to the Prose *Kāvya*, precludes all necessity of connecting it genetically with the primitive mode of verse and prose narrative found in the Pali Jātaka or in the Fable literature, in which the verse is chiefly of a moralising or recapitulatory character, or in the inscriptional records, where the verse is evidently ornamental, or in the purely hypothetical Vedic *Ākhyāna*, which is alleged to have contained slender prose as the mere connecting link of more important verse.

The *Campū*, thus, shares the features of both Sanskrit prose and poetry, but the mosaic is hardly of an attractive pattern. Excepting rarely outstanding treatment here and there, the large number of *Campūs* that exist scarcely shows any special characteristic in matter and manner which is not already familiar to us, in their best and worst forms, from the regularly composed metrical and prose *Kāvya*. The subject is generally drawn from legendary sources, although in some later *Campūs*, as we shall see presently, miscellaneous subjects find a place. The *Campū* has neither the sinewy strength and efficiency of real prose, nor the weight and power of real poetry; the prose seeking to copy *ex abundanti* the brocaded stateliness of the prose *Kathā* and the verse reproducing the conventional ornateness of the metrical *Kāvya*. The form, no doubt, affords scope for versatility, but the *Campū*-writer, as a rule, has no original voice of his own. The history of the *Campū*, therefore, is of no great literary importance, but it is a peculiar literary type; and it would be interesting to notice here some of the better known works which are in print.

The earliest known *Campū* appears to be the *Nala-campū* or *Damayantī-kathā*[2] of Trivikrama-bhaṭṭa, whose date is inferred from the fact that he also composed the Nausari inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III in 915 A.D.[3] The work pretends to narrate the old epic story of *Nala* and *Damayantī*, but the accessories and stylistic affectations of laboured composition entirely overgrow the little incident that there is in it, and only a small part of the story is told in its seven *Ucchvāsas*. The poet himself describes his work as abounding in puns and difficult constructions, for he believes in the display of verbal complexities after the manner of Bāṇa and Subandhu, and deliberately, but wearisomely, imitates their interminably descriptive, ingeniously recondite and massively ornamented style. He has a decided talent in this direction, as well as skill in metrical composition, and elegant verses from his *Campū* are culled by the Anthologists,[4] but beyond this ungrudgingly made admission, it is scarcely possible to go further in the way of praise.

To the same century and same category of artificial writing belongs the *Yaśastilaka-campū*[5] of the *Digambara* Jaina Somadeva Sūri, an extentive work in eight *Āśvāsas*, composed in 959 A.D. in the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king

---

[2] Ed. Durgaprasad and Sivadatta, with the comm. of Caṇḍa-Pāla (c. 1230 A.D.), NSP, 1885, 3rd ed., Bombay, 1921; also ed. Chowkhambha Skt. Series, Benares, 1932. The poet describes himself as the son of Nemāditya of the *Śāṇḍilya-gotra* and grandson of Śrīdhara.

[3] D. R. Bhandarkar in *Epi. Ind.*, ix, p, 28, Trivikrama also wrote *Mandālasā-campū* (ed. J. B. Modaka and K. N. Sane, in *Kāvyetihāsa-saṃgraha*, Poona 1882). He is quoted anonymously in Bhoja's *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa* (*Parvatabhedi pavitram ad* iv. 36=*Nala-campū* vi. 29).

[4] All the verses quoted in *Subhāṣitāvalī Śārṅgadhara-paddhati* and *Padyāvalī* are traceable in the *Nalacampū*; see S. K. De, *Padyāvalī*, pp. 206-7.

[5] Ed. Kedarnath and others, in two parts, with the comm. of Śrutasāgara Sūri, NSP, 2nd ed., Bombay, 1916.

Kṛṣṇa, under the patronage of his feudatory, a son of the Cālukyå Arikeśarin II. It relates the legend of Yaśodhara, lord of Avantī, the machinations of his wife, his death and repeated rebirths, and final conversion into the Jaina faith. The story, based upon Guṇabhadra's *Uttara-purāṇa*, is not new, having been the subject of many a Jaina work, like the *Apabhraṃśa Jasaharacariu*[6] of Puṣpadanta and the Sanskrit *Yaśodhara-carita*[7] of Vādirāja Sūri; but it is narrated here, not normally, but in the embellished mode established by Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa's *Kādambarī*, one of its distinctive features being the treatment of the motif of rebirths. A large part of the narrative[8] indeed deals with experience of different births, but a resolution is at last made to put an end to transmigration by following the teachings of a Jaina sage, named Sudatta. These teachings form the subject of the last three *Āśvāsas* of the work, added as a kind of popular manual of devotion (*Upāsakādhyayana* or Reading for the Devotee) explanatory of the Jaina religious texts. This didactic motive and interweaving of doctrinal matter practically run through the entire work, which Somadeva, like most Jaina authors, makes a means of his religious end. A vast array of authorities, pedantic and poetical, for instance, is assembled in the king's polemic against the killing of animals in sacrifice, while a knowledge of polity is displayed in the elaborate discussion between the king and his ministers. It cannot be denied that Somadeva is highly learned, as well as skilled in constructing magniloquent prose sentences and turning out an

---

[6] Ed. P. L. Vaidya, Karañja Jaina Series, Karañja, Berar, 1931.

[7] Ed. T. A. Gopinath Rao, Sarasvatī Vilāsa Series, Tanjore 1912. In four cantos, composed in the beginning of the 11th century. The author wrote his *Pārśvanātha-carita* in 1025 A.D.

[8] For an analysis of the work, see Peterson, Second Report, Bombay, 1884, pp. 35—46.

elegant mass of descriptive and sentimental verses; but the purely literary value of his work has been much exaggerated. If his earnest religious motive is the source of an added interest, it is too obtrusive and dreary to be improved by his respectable rhetoric and pellucid prosody.

These two earlier *Campū* works are fair specimens of the type; and it is not necessary to make more than a bare mention of later and less meritorious attempts. The Jaina legend of *Jīvaṃdhara*, also based on the *Uttara-purāṇa*, forms the subject of the *Jīvaṃdhara-campū*[9] of uncertain date, composed in eleven *Lambhakas* by Haricandra, who is probably identical with the *Digambara* Jaina Haricandra, the author of the *Dharma-śarmābhyudaya*.[10] The later *Campūs* of Hindu authors are no better, their subjects being drawn from the Epics and the *Purāṇas*. The *Rāmāyaṇa-campū*,[11] ascribed to Bhoja, extends up to the *Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa* of the epic story, the sixth or *Yuddha-kāṇḍa* being made up by Lakṣmaṇa-bhaṭṭa, son of Gaṅgādhara and Gaṅgāmbikā, while some manuscripts give a seventh or *Uttara-kāṇḍa* by Veṅkaṭarāja. Similarly, Ananta-bhaṭṭa wrote a *Bhārata-campū*[12] in twelve *Stavakas*. There are several *Bhāgavata-campūs*,[13] for instance, by Cidambara (in three *Stavakas*),

---

9 Ed. T. S. Kuppusvami Sastri, Sarasvatī Vilāsa Series, Tanjore 1905.

10 Ed. Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, NSP, Bombay, 1899. It is in 21 cantos, and deals with the story of Dharmanātha, the fifteenth Tīrthankara on the direct model of Māgha's poem.

11 Printed many times in India. Ed. K. P. Parab, with the comm. of Rāmachandra Bhudendra, NSP, Bombay, 1898. This edition contains the 6th *Kāṇḍa* of *Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa*. Another supplement entitled, *Yuddha-kāṇḍa-campū*, by Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita is known (ed. T. R. Cintamani in *IHQ*, vi, 1930, pp. 629-38).

12 Ed. K. P. Parab, with comm, of Rāmacandra Bhudendra, NSP, Bombay 1903 (also ed. 1916). Very often printed in India.

13 See P. P. S. Sastri, *Tanjore Catalogue*, vii. p. 3082f,—Several other *Campūs* on the stories of the two epics and the *Bhāgavata* are listed in the different catalogues of manuscripts.

by Rāmabhadra and by Rājanātha. On the separate episodes of the Epics and the *Bhāgavata*, there are also several *Campūs*, but they are not so well known. The *Purāṇa* myths also claimed a large number of *Campūs*; for instance, the *Nṛsiṃha-campū* of Keśava-bhaṭṭa,[14] son of Nārāyaṇa (in six *stavakas*), by Daivajña Sūrya[15] (in five *Ucchvāsas*), and by Saṅkarṣaṇa (in four *Ullāsas*), all dealing with the story of *Prahlāda's* deliverance by the Man-Lion incarnation of *Viṣṇu*. The *Pārijāta-haraṇa-campū*[16] of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, is concerned with the well known *Purāṇa* legend of Kṛṣṇa's exploit. The *Nīlakaṇṭha-vijaya-campū*[17] of the South Indian Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita was composed in 1637 A.D. on the myth of the churning of the ocean by gods.[18] All these are rather literary exercises than creative works.

The *Campū* form of composition appears to have been popular and largely cultivated in Southern India, but

---

[14] Ed. Hariprasad Bhagavat, Krishnaji Ganapat Press, Bombay 1909.

[15] Son of Jñānādhirāja of Pārthapara. He was an astronomer of some repute, who wrote his *Sūrya-prakāśa* in 1539 A.D. and his commentary on the *Līlāvatī* in 1542 A.D. He also wrote the *Rāma-kṛṣṇa-viloma-kāvya*, a small poem of 36 or 38 stanzas which praises in alternate half verses Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, the text given by the second half when read backward being the same as that of the first half read forward (ed. Kāvyamālā, Gucchaka ix, NSP, Bombay, 1899—36 verses; ed. Haeberlin, reprinted in Jivananda's *Kāvya-saṅgraha*, iii, pp. 463-65—38 verses).

[16] Ed. Durgaprasada and K.P. Parab, NSP, 2nd ed. Bombay, 1889, 1900. The author also wrote the drama *Kaṃsa-vadha* in seven acts (ed. NSP, Bombay, 1888). The author lived in the court of Akbar and wrote this work for Todar Mall's son.

[17] Ed. C. Sankararama Sastri, Bālamanoramā Press, Madras 1924. Also ed. J. B. Modaka and K. N. Sane in *Kavyetihāsa-Saṅgraha*, Poona 1882.

[18] The *Svāhā-sudhākara* (ed. Kāvyamālā, Gucchaka iv, p. 52f) of the Kerala poet Nārāyaṇa, who lived towards the end of the 16th century, is sometimes taken as a *Campū*, but it is really a short poem (26 verses), with occasional prose, presenting the rather thin Purāṇic story of the love of Svāhā and the Moon god.

nothing will be gained by pursuing its history further except mentioning some curious developments in the hands of some later practitioners of the type. We find that not only myths and legends were drawn upon as themes, but that the form came to be widely and conveniently applied to purposes other than purely literary. Occasional description, philosophical or technical exposition and religious propaganda became some of the non-literary objectives of the *Campū*. Thus, Samarapuṅgava Dīkṣita, son of Veṅkaṭeśa and Anantāmmā of *Vādhūla-gotra*, wrote towards the third quarter of the 16th century his *Yātrā-* (or *Tīrthayātrā-*) *prabandha*,[19] describing in nine *Āśvāsas*, with plenty of interspersed verses, a pilgrimage which he undertook with his elder brother to the holy shrines of Southern India, and incidentally enlarging upon the stock poetic subjects of the six seasons, sunrise, sunset, erotic sports and the like. The work is a praiseworthy attempt to divert the *Campū* from its narrow groove, but the traditional rhetoric thwarts and prevents the assertion of a natural vein. The *Varadāmbikā-pariṇaya*[20] of the woman-poet Tirumalāmbā, gives a highly romantic version, in the usual mannered style, of an historical incident in the career of the Vijayanagara king Acyutarāya. It describes the romance of the love and wedding of Varadāmbikā with the author's own husband and royal lover Acyutarāya. The *Citra-campū* of Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra[21] eulogises the author's

[19] Ed. Kedarnath and V. L. Panshikar, NSP, Bombay 1908. It is the same work as that noticed, but vaguely described, by Eggeling, *Ind. Office Cat.*, vii, p. 1538, no. 4036.

[20] Ed. Lakshman Sarup, Lahore 1938(?). The editor notes that the *Campū* contains the largest compounds to be found in Sanskrit, but this is hardly complimentary!—See P. P. S. Sastri, *Tanjore Catalogue*, vii, pp. 3245-46, no. 4220.

[21] Ed. Ramcharan Chakravarti, Benares, 1940. For MS see Eggeling, *India Office Catalogue* vii, pp. 1543-45, no. 4044. The work was composed about 1744 A.D.—Śrīharśa mentions a

patron, Citrasena of Vardhamāna (Burdwan), Bengal, and gives some quasi-historical information about the Maratha raid of Bengal of 1742 A.D. The versatile Veṅkaṭādhvarin,[22] son of Raghunātha and Sītāmbā of the *Ātreya-gotra* of Conjeevaram, whose literary activity was almost synchronous with that of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, conceived the idea of quickening the *Campū* with a mild zest for disputation and satire. He composed a curious *Campū*, entitled *Viśva-guṇādarśa*,[23] in which two *Gandharvas*, *Viśvāvasu* and *Kṛśānu*, take a bird's-eye view of various countries from their aerial car, the former generous in appreciation of their qualities, the latter censorious of their defects. The device is adapted in the *Tattva-guṇādarśa*[24] of Annayārya, which describes the comparative merits of *Śaivism* and *Vaiṣṇavism* in the form of a conversation between Jaya and Vijaya, a Śaivite and a Vaiṣṇavite respectively. Local legends and festivals, or praise of local deities and personages also supply the inspiration of many a *Campū*. The *Śrīnivāsa-vilāsa-campū*[25] of Veṅkaṭeśa, for instance, describes the glory of the well known deity Śrī *Veṅkaṭeśvara* of Tirupati in the highly artificial style of Subandhu. The *Vedāntācārya-*

Navasāhasāṅka-carita-campū composed by himself, in his *Naiṣadha* (xxii. 22), presumably on an historical theme: but nothing is known of this work.

[22] Veṅkaṭādhvarin was a voluminous writer, and composed, among other works, the *Yādava-rāghavīya* (a short *Dvi-sandhāna Kāvya* of about three hundred verses, which relates, by the *Viloma* device, tre stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Bhāgavata* simultaneously), a supplement (the *Uttara-kāṇḍa*) to Bhoja's *Rāmāyaṇa-campū*, and several poems, plays and *Stotras*. See *Ind. Culture*, vi, p. 227 for other works of this author.

[23] Ed. B G. Yogi and M. G. Bakre, NSP, 5th ed. Bombay, 1923; also ed. with a commentary, Karnatak Press, Bombay 1889.

[24] See *Descriptive Cat., Madras Govt. Orient. Lib.*, xxi, p. 8223, no. 12295.

[25] Ed. Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, NSP, Bombay, 1893,

vijaya[26] of *Kavi-tārkika-siṁha* Vedāntācārya describes the life of the South Indian teacher. Vedāntadeśika, the disputations held by him with *Advaitins* and his polemic successes. The *Vidvan-moda-taraṅgiṇī*[27] of Rāmacandra Ciranjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, a comparatively modern work, is a witty composition which brings together the followers of schools and sects, and, by means of their exposition, pools together the essence of various beliefs and doctrines. But the most strange application of the *Campū* form occurs in the *Mandāra-maranda-campū*[28] of Kṛṣṇa, which is nominally a *Campū* but is in fact a regular treatise on rhetoric and prosody, composed with elaborate definitions and illustrations.

As the Jaina writers made use of the *Campū* for religious propaganda, the Bengal *Vaiṣṇava* school also did the same in respect of their creed and belief in the *Kṛṣṇa*-legend, not only presenting erotico-religious pictures of great sensuous charm, but also making it the vehicle of their elaborate theology. The *Muktā-caritra*[29] of Raghunātha-dāsa, a disciple of Caitanya, relates a short tale, in which Kṛṣṇa demonstrates that pearls could be grown as a crop by sowing and watering them with milk, but of which the real object is to show the superior-

---

26 *Descriptive Cat., Madras Govt. Orient. Lib.*, xxi, p. 8290, no. 12365.

27 Ed. Venkatesvara Press, Bombay 1912. The author's *Mādhava-campū* has been edited by Satyavrata Samasrami, Calcutta, 1831. For the author, see S.K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics*, i. p. 294. He lived in the first half of the 18th century. his *Vṛtta-ratnāvalī*, a work on Prosody in honour of Yaśovanta Siṁha, Nāyeb-Dewān of Dacca under Sujā-ul-daulah of Bengal, being dated 1731 A.D.

28 Ed. Kedarnath and V. L. Panshikar, NSP, Bombay, 2nd ed., 1924. As the work copies some definitions farm Appayya Dīkṣita, it cannot be earlier than the 17th century. The *Rasa-prakāśa* commentary on Mammaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa* is probably his.

29 Ed. Notyasvarupa Brahmachari, Devakinandan Press, Brindāban, 1917, in Bengli characters.

ity of Kṛṣṇa's free love for Rādhā over his wedded love for Satyabhāmā. But the *Gopāla-campū*[30] of Jīva Gosvāmin, nephew of Rūpa Gosvāmin, and the *Ānanda-vṛndāvana-campū*[31] of Paramānanda-dāsa-sena Kavi-karṇapūra are much more extensive and elaborate works, which describe the childhood, youth and manhood of Kṛṣṇa in a lavishly luscious and rhetorical style. Kavi-karṇapūra's work deals in twenty-two *Stavakas* with the early life of Kṛṣṇa at Vṛndāvana; but Jīva's huge *Campū* in 70 chapters (which occupy 3940 pages in the Calcutta printed edition!) envisages the entire career of Kṛṣṇa, and makes modification in the legends in accordance with the *Vaiṣṇava* theology of the Bengal school, of which it is more of the nature of a *Siddhānta-grantha.*

30 Ed. Nityasvarup Brahmachari, in two parts (*Pūrva* and *Uttara Khaṇḍas*), Devakinandan Press, Brindavan 1904; also ed. Rasavihāri Sāṅkhyatīrtha, with comm. of Vīracandra, in two parts, Devakinandan Press, Calcutta, 1908-1913, in Bengali characters.

31 Ed. in the *Pandit*, vol. ix and x, New Series, vols. i-iii; also published in parts, by Madhusudan Das, with comm. of Viśvanātha Cakravartin, Hugli, 1918, etc., in Bengali characters (incomplete). For a detailed account of these two Bengal *Vaiṣṇava Campūs*, see S.K. De, *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1942, pp. 472-493.

THE LOCATION OF UḌḌIYĀNA

By Dr. B. Bhattacharya

The location of *Uḍḍiyāna* still remains unsettled. According to Tibetan traditions *Uḍḍiyāna* is the place where *Tāntric* Buddhism took its origin, and hence a correct, or at least an approximate, location is important for the historians of Buddhist *Tāntric* culture.

Uḍḍiyāna is sometimes placed in the Swat valley, but it is also identified with the distant Kashgarh. Although sometimes it is also equated with Orissa, the latest tendency seems to be in favour of locating *Uḍḍiyāna* in Bengal or Assam.

Uḍḍiyāna is frequently mentioned in *Tāntric* Buddhist literature, and by Tibetan authorities, such as Taranath and Sumpa. The confusion regarding the location of the place seems to arise from the hazy ideas of Taranath and Sumpa who could not understand the difference in sound between *Uḍḍiyāna*, *Oḍra*, *Odryāna* or *Oḍiviśa*, and *Urgyen*. While *Uḍḍiyāna*, *Oḍḍiyāna* or *Oḍiyāna* is the place where *Tāntric* Buddhism took its origin, *Oḍra*, *Oḍryāna* or *Oḍiviśa* is the name of a country which is almost equivalent to modern Orissa. The third *Urgyen* is the same as *Udyāna* in the Swat valley.

According to the fancy of different scholars *Uḍḍiyāna* may be identified either with Orissa or *Udyāna* of the Swat valley, but how it can be taken to the distant Kashgarh defies my imagination.

Uḍḍiyāna is mentioned in the *Sādhanamālā* rather frequently. The earliest manuscript of the *Sādhanamālā* is dated in the Newari era 285, or 1165 A.D. In this work *Uḍḍiyāna* is connected with the *Sādhana* of *Kurukullā*, *Trailokyavaśaṅkara*—a variety of *Avalokiteśvara*,

Mārīcī—the sow-faced goddess, and the furious deity *Vajrayoginī*. The *Sādhanamālā* also connects *Uḍḍiyāna* with such *Tāntric* authors as Sarahapāda who composed a Sanskrit work: *Oḍiyāna-vinirgata-mahāguhya-tattvopadeśa*. The *Sādhanamālā* further mentions *Uḍḍiyāna* along with the three other *Pīṭhas*,—*Kāmākhyā*, *Sirihaṭṭa* and *Pūrṇagiri*,—while describing the *Sādhana* of *Vajrayoginī*. Besides these, the *Jñānasiddhi* of Indrabhūti—a *Vajrayāna* work of great fame—mentions it in the last colophon as *Śrīmadoḍiyāna-vinirgata*, thereby connecting Indrabhūti the author with *Uḍḍiyāna*.

Can we with the help of the material above indicated from purely Sanskrit sources, locate *Uḍḍiyāna* correctly? *Uḍḍiyāna* being one of the four *Pīṭhas* sacred to *Vajrayoginī* should be at least near *Kāmākhyā* (*Kāmarūpa*) and *Sirihaṭṭa* (Sylhet) in Assam, and it is not unusual to think that all these four *Pīṭhas* received their sanctity from temples dedicated to the furious Buddhist deity *Vajrayoginī*. In order to locate *Uḍḍiyāna* in Bengal or Assam or to connect the place with *Vajrayoginī* it is not necessary for us to rely on Tibetan sources.

But the Tibetan sources throw no less light on the problem of the identity of *Uḍḍiyāna*. Indrabhūti is said to be the king of *Uḍḍiyāna* in Tibetan traditions. He was the father of Padmasambhava who married the sister of the famous Buddhist logician Śāntarakṣita of Zāhor. Tibetan history also records that Śāntarakṣita and his brother-in-law Padmasambhava together founded the first regular monastery at Samye in Tibet in the year 749 A.D. Thus *Uḍḍiyāna* is connected with another locality which is called by Tibetans as Zāhor.

The pressure of evidence in favour of *Uḍḍiyāna* being located in Bengal is so overwhelming, that this fact is gradually being realised by sensible writers, and an excellent résumé of the problem will be found in *Indian*

Historical Quarterly, Vol. XI (1935), pp. 142f. under an article entitled '*Uḍḍiyāna and Sāhore*' by Mr. Nalini Nath Das Gupta. It is not necessary to repeat here all that Mr. Das Gupta has said in his learned article, or his conclusions.

The chief reason why *Uḍḍiyāna* should be located in Bengal is that the *Tāntric mystics* who are said to be connected with *Uḍḍiyāna* are also described by Taranath and Sumpa as Bengalis.

But in what part of Bengal *Uḍḍiyāna* should be located? The location of *Uḍḍiyāna* is again dependent on the identification of Zāhor, the native place of Śāntarakṣita whose sister was given to Padmasambhava in marriage. Zāhor is identified with *Sābhār*, a 7th-8th century village in the Dacca district.

In this short paper I offer a suggestion for the location of *Uḍḍiyāna* near *Sābhār* in the Dacca district.

Dr. N. K. Bhattasali has shown that in mediæval times, *Vaṅga* and *Samataṭa* were the two important centres of culture in Bengal. *Vaṅga* included the present Dacca, Faridpur and Backarganj districts while *Samataṭa* comprised the present Sylhet, Chittagong, Tipperah and Mymensing districts. That *Vaṅga* and *Samataṭa* were the two great centres of culture in Bengal is shown by the numerous Buddhist and Brahmanical images of the early *Tāntric* type discovered in this region. Numerous old inscriptions, remains of old buildings, coins and terracottas found in these regions also confirm the opinion of Dr. Bhattasali.

In this *Vaṅga-Samataṭa* region, one of the most important and one of the most historical places is Vikramapura in the Dacca district. Any one acquainted with the ancient inscriptions of Bengal will be able to appreciate the importance of Vikramapura which is sometimes mentioned as the seat from which imperial charters were

issued. There was a great Buddhist monastery here in the reign of the Chandras and the Senas. *Atīśa Dīpaṅkara*, famous in Tibetan history, is said to have been born in the royal family of Vikramapura. *Pargana* Vikramapura even to this day retains its ancient tradition of greatness in being recognised as one of the foremost places of culture in East Bengal.

In *Pargana* Vikramapura there is a fairly large and well-populated village which is now known by the rather extraordinary name of *Vajrayoginī* (pronounced as *Bajrajoginī*). Round about this village numerous *Vajrayāna* images have been found, and amongst them we notice images of *Jambhala*, *Parṇaśabarī*, *Vajrasattva* and *Tārā*.

Apart from these purely Buddhistic and *Tāntric* evidences, the name of the village itself is most interesting. Why should the village be called by the name of *Vajrayoginī*? We know *Vajrayoginī* to be a violent Buddhist deity of the *Vajrayāna* pantheon. She is the Buddhist original of the Hindu *Chinnamastā*, although *Vajrayoginī* is credited with a less violent form also. (*Sādhanamālā* No. 233).

The term '*Vajra*' in *Vajrayoginī* is a familiar Buddhist term. *Vajra* is equivalent to '*Śūnya*'. Thus the name of the village appears to me to be unmistakably Buddhist, and I am inclined to believe that the village derived its present name from the temple of *Vajrayoginī* which must have been then in existence in early times.

It has already been pointed out that temples dedicated to *Vajrayoginī* could only be expected at four places according to the two references in the *Sādhanamālā*. These four places are *Kāmākhyā*, *Sirihaṭṭa*, *Pūrṇagiri* and *Uḍḍiyāna*. Out of these *Kāmākhyā* and *Sirihaṭṭa* have retained their original names, *Pūrṇagiri* which signifies a hill is not identified yet with certainty. But it is

possible to spot the fourth place *Uḍḍiyāna* which should be near *Sābhār* and should be connected with *Vajrayoginī*. Thus it becomes evident that the present village of *Vajrayoginī* was originally known as *Uḍḍiyāna*, but as the deity *Vajrayoginī* became more popular later, the original name gradually disappeared giving place to the name of the deity. Such changes in the place-names are not rare in any part of India (compare—Kālighāṭ, Jagannāth, Tārakeśvara, Ambājī, Bechrājī, etc.). That the place was connected with *Śakti* worship can be seen from the temple of *Kālī* at present existing in the village.

According to the *Vajrayoginī Sādhana*, *Uḍḍiyāna* was sacred to *Vajrayoginī*, and perhaps the temple of *Vajrayoginī* was its chief temple. It was a centre of *Śakti* worship as *Vajrayoginī* is to-day. Would it be deviating too far from science if the present village of *Vajrayoginī* is equated with the ancient *Uḍḍiyāna*? The identification proposed here may or may not be correct, but I think I have indicated here sufficiently the importance of the ancient village in the Vikramapur *Pargana*. We ought to study the village and its surroundings better in the expectation of valuable historical and cultural data.

URDU MARSIYA (FROM EARLIEST TIME UP TO 1840 A.D.)

BY CAPTAIN S. M. ZAMIN ALI.

Pleasure and pain are the two chief aspects of human nature. Happiness and grief are the two fruits of life which every soul has got to taste frequently. Involuntary ejaculations or sighs are the outbursts of excessive joy or intense pain. These outbursts suggest that while a person is lost in happiness or overpowered with grief, he is unconsciously betraying his inner feelings and unintentionally inviting the hearer to share his joy or grief. The ejaculations and sighs cannot do more than to arouse the attention and curiosity. In order to make the hearer share one's grief or happiness it is necessary that the ejaculations and sighs should be imitated in words. If they are given suitable and effective expression of words they create the same emotion in the mind of the hearer. Whatever be the form of expression—be it prose or poetry—the electricity of poignant words would not fail in impressing the heart more or less. But poetry, as it has been defined as 'the fit expression of fit emotions', would be more suitable for the purpose. In poetry deep interests of life are spoken of intimately and sincerely. The forms of conventions and restraints of art lend dignity to expressions and enhance the sharpness of words. No such thing is possible in prose. Moreover poetry is a touchstone for insincerity. If a poet does not feel what he desires to express, he cannot make a successful poem. The faithful expression in poetry of a sincere feeling would, like wireless telegraphy, impress the heart of the hearer. There is a well-known saying in Persian 'انچه از دل خیزد بر دل ریزد' in Urdu جو دل سے نکلتی ہے بات' دل میں اتر جاتی ہے

(whatever comes from heart goes direct into the heart) *e.g.*

اك هوك جگر ميں اٹھتی هے اك درد سا دل ميں هوتا هے

ميں راتوں كو اٹھه اٹھه روتا هوں جب سارا عالم سوتا هے

Again, "Poetry is imaginative passion." The quiikest and subtlest test of the possession of its essence is in expression. The variety of things to be expressed show the amount of its resources and the continuity of the song completes the evidence of its strength and greatness. It includes whatsoever of painting can be made visible to the mind's eyes and whatsoever of music can be conveyed by sound and proportion without singing or instrumentations. The highest class of poetry, as has universally been admitted, is the epic which contains thought, feeling, emotion, expression, imagination, action, character and continuity, all in the largest amount and highest degree. It includes the drama with narrations besides, or the speaking and action of the characters with the speaking of the poet himself.

It was by virtue of these qualities that poetry was adopted for writing marsiya or elegy. Although Marsiya literally means "To mourn the deceased", it gives an account of the heroic deeds of the departed soul as well. A poet does not, rather cannot, mourn alone. He makes the whole world around him share his grief. He does not only describe in plain words the qualities of the deceased, or the circumstances to which he was driven, or the noble death, or the notable death with which he met, but gives such touches to his narrations and decorates it with such gloomy accessories that every word of it plays daggers to the heart of the hearer.

This sort of poetry is found in one form or the other almost in all literatures of the world. For instance, *Lycidas* by Milton, *In Memoriam* by Tennyson and *Elegy* by Gray and many others in English; Qasaid of Marsiyas in Arabic, Regular Marsiyas and قطعات تاریخ etc. in

Persian. As to Sanskrit in Kalidasa's "*Kumāra Sambhava*" Rati (Venus) laments the death of Kāma (Cupid).

Before we go further let me say that although the term marsiya can literally be applied to any poetic expression of grief and lamentation on the loss of anything or person, yet it has got a special significance too. Hughes' *Dictionary of Islam* gives the meaning of Marsiya on page 327 in the following words:—

"The term marsiya is especially applied to those sung during the Moharram in commemoration of the great tragedy of Husain and his followers at Karabala." This is the correct sense in which we use the word. The single word marsiya, unless the name on whom it is written is mentioned, always denotes what the learned compiler of the *Dictionary of Islam* has written and it would be in this sense that I shall use the word hereafter.

It may also be added that I shall be inserting at places in this essay instances of composition from model authors simply to show the different stages of the development of Marsiya. As such random quotations do not fully represent the poet or his work a bit more than what a nutshell can show of the whole universe, it is hoped that the reader will kindly read the entire work of an author to realize and endorse the force of the critical remarks made in this article.

As Urdu, with which we are concerned at present, owes to Arabic and Persian Literatures very much for its poetry, let us take a cursory view of the marsiyas in these languages.

In tracing the origin of marsiya the Arabs have gone so far back as the time of Adam. According to them Adam showed the lines of marsiya by mourning the loss of Paradise and lamenting the death of his son. The language and form in which he lamented are not known to us but plain it is that the first expression which the first

man made in this bleak and dreary world was that of grief and thus marsiyas being only the regular expressions of pathetic emotions and sentiments took their birth at the very moment when Adam set his foot on this earth.

The Arabs used to compose marsiyas in the same form and with the same poetic restrictions as they did the Qasidas. Like Qasidas, Marsiyas too had on some occasions been the cause of exciting one tribe against the other and arousing martial spirit in the army. Simplicity, fluency, and pathos were the notable features of marsiyas in those days. Here is a specimen taken from the Marsiyas composed by دعبل خزاعی

آفاطِمُ لو خلت الحسين مجدلاً * قد مات عطشانا بشط فرات

اذا لطمت الخد فاطم عنده * و. اجريت و مع العين فی الوخبات

"O Fatima! If you were to live and see how your son Husain in his thirst was butchered on the bank of Euphrates, you would surely have torn your face and wept with tears of blood."

In Persian the form of Marsiyas remained for some time the same as in Arabic. Later on the Persians, perhaps not liking to confine themselves in one form only, invented several forms and adopted different metres. They invented the forms of

سوز - سلام - نوحه - واقعات - ترکیب بند - ترجیع بند and ترویح

In all these forms with the exception of واقعات, the Persians used to compose the lamentations only. In واقعات, they used to narrate the events as well as the tragic portion and the lamentations. The term Marsiya, by virtue of its literal meaning, could be applied to any of the said forms. Intensity of pathos, height of imagination, force of style and poignancy of description are the remarkable characteristics of the Persian Marsiyas. Here is a specimen taken from the Marsiya composed by محتشم کاشی

چو خوں ز حلق تشنۂ او بر زمیں رسید
جوش از زمیں بہ ذروۂ عرش بریں رسید
نخل بلند او چو خساں بر زمیں زدند
طوفاں بہ آسماں ز غبار زمیں رسید
باد آں غبار چوں بہ مزار نبی رساند
گرد از مدینہ برفلک هفتمیں رسید
کرد ایں خیال وهم غلط کارکاں غبار
تا دامن جلال جہاں آفریں رسید
هست از ملال گرچہ بری ذات ذوالجلال
او در دل ست و هیچ دلے نیست جز ملال

Urdu at first adopted the lines of Persians for its Marsiyas. Like other forms of Urdu Poetry, Marsiya, too, took its birth in the Deccan. After the overthrow of Bahmani Kingdom (of which the last king was Mahmud Bahmani Shah) Sultan Quli Qutub Shah captured the throne in 1518. As he himself was a poet, the art of poetry was very much patronized by him. It was in his time that Marsiya was composed by Shuja Uddin Nuri for the first time in Urdu. Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah while composing love-songs has given expression to his religious feelings and beliefs in the following lines :—

دو جگ اماماں دکھہ تھے سب جیو کرتے زاری واے واے
تن روں کی لکڑ جان کر کرتے هیں خواری واے واے
اسماں چھج جالا هوا سورج اگن والا هوا
چندر سورج کالا هوا اے دکھہ ایاری واے واے

صدا تو مدح علی اور نبی کي کہتا هے
معانی شعر ترا تو لکھے هیں دست بدست
حسین جی کی شہادت هوئی جو کربل میں
تو برگ شاخ بھی مارے هے اپنا دست بدست

His successors took the title of Qutub Shah and almost all of them were poets. Abdullah Qutub Shah says:—

جب وو ابر رحمت اس جگہ پر ھوا ہے فیض بار
شیعیان کے تئیں اتھا وہ دن مگر بھبود کا

The marsiyas were composed by almost all the poets of the age.

The marsiyas had become so popular that they were composed in Tamil and Telegu as well. The full text of Marsiyas is extinct but couplets from here and there are to be found in those recited in majlises. Shuja Uddin Nuri, Hashim Burhanpuri and Kazim Ali were the best marsiya writers during the 16th century and their compositions are still found in the Edinburgh University Library.

The Marsiyas were written in those days either in the form of نظم مسلسل or scattered couplets. They took the form of مربع later on. The marsiyas of this time were full of pathos and simplicity and have been written merely for being recited in majlises. Some instances of the marsiyas composed in the Deccan during the Adil Shahi and Qutub Shahi reign (which came to an end in 1686 and 1687 respectively) are given below:—

شجاع الدین نوری

کوئی نظم اس میں تو کرتا نہ تھا
ولے سب تعصب دیا ھم مٹا
نہ کچھہ خوف کھایا نہ جھجھکا ذرا
وھم مرثیے سے سھل کردیا
شروع میں کیا نظم کل واقعا
وھم تک کا احوال پورا لکھا
میں جب اس کو لوگوں کے آگے پڑھا
عجب حال عاشور خانہ میں تھا
جن و انس کرتے تھے سب واہ وا
کہ دکھن میں لکھا گیا مرثیا

زماں اپنے میں کس نے ایسا لکھا
کبھی اس سے پہلے سناتے پڑھا
اماماں سے اِس کا ملے گا صلا
کہ ہے نوری موجد تو اس طرز کا

غوّاصی

دستا نہیں کروں کیا او بیان کربلا کا
پھرتا ہوں زار ہوں میں حیران کربلا کا
آسمان تے خدایا' جبریل اوتر کو آیا
روتا اوپر تے لایا فرمان کربلا کا
کمر باندھ کربلا میں کر شکر ہر بلا میں
کیوں ہے کہ کربلا میں سلطان کربلا کا
ہے دکھ بڑا یو سب تے نین کس قرابت تے
پکڑ یا حسین جب تے میدان کربلا کا
دکھ سر ملک لئے ہیں ماتم زدے ہوئے ہیں
رو رو دریا کٹے ہیں آسمان کربلا کا
جلتا ہے سور جوتی دنیا کھڑی ہے روتی
کان تے ہوا یو کوفی مہمان کربلا کا
منجھ سک نہیں ہے دو کہ بن ہوں میں نت ہال چھن چھن
لا گیا ہے رات ہور دن منجھ دھیان کربلا کا
کرو رو رو کر بسارا منجھ شاد کرتے هارا
سو ہے حسین پیارا شہ جان کربلا کا
غواصیا معطر عالم کوں سب کیا ہے
گویا یو مرثیہ ہے ریحان کربلا کا

ماہ محرم سوز سوں آیا اهل دل منیر سوں
روتا عالم یک ریز سوں کیا کام کیتا هائے هائے
کر بادشاهی پر منم شاهاں کوں دیتا غم پو غم
مظلوم پر کرنے ستم حیفی نہ کھایا هائے هائے

دکھہ شاہ زادے کون دیا بدنامی اپنے سرلیا
آخر او کافر کیوں کیا اپناچ بتایا ہائے ہائے
روتے ملک سب عرش لگ سورج ستارا اپنا جھلک
مشرق سے تا مغرب تلک اندکار پاریا ہائے ہائے
غم سون پکر بیت الحزن یعقوب نے کھویا نین
شیریں کے بہانے کوہ کن آپ جیو گنوایا ہائے ہائے
بولے غواصی مرثیہ سن روئے دکن کے اولیا
ہر سال کا یو مرثیہ کیا کام کیتا ہائے ہائے

عبداللہ قطب شاہ—وفات سنہ ۱۰۸۳ھ مطابق سنہ ۱۶۷۲ع

علی ہور فاطمہ کرتے ہیں دونو آہ زاری بھی
حسن کا سور حسین کا دوکہ لے آیا جگ پو خواری بھی
حسین چب چلے لڑنے سر ان یہیں پر لگے پڑنے
شہیدان ہر طرف چڑنے لگیا یو دوکہ پیاری بھی
شہر بانو کہی آکر کہ اے سنسار کے سرور
منجے غربت نے بہا کر نہ جاؤ چھور باری بھی
منجے کے جاوتے یوں حال تمن بعد از میرا کیا حال
کرو مت غم نے پائمال دیو درس تمہاری بھی
علی اکبر کہے میں جانوں سو پیاساں جو پیا لے لاتوں
زخم کھا کر آئے پھر اب تھا نون بھی ہے مشک ساری بھی
دیکھہ طفلاں منگے پانی نہ کر ذرہ مہربانی
ستم سوں تیر مارا نے کئے او نابکاری بھی
حسین پانی پنی اے یزیداں تیر برسائے
سو پانی پینے نہیں پائے لگے کلہ لہو کی دھاری بھی
بغیر ار ظلم بیدادی نہ تھی اس وقت کچھہ شادی
ہوئی قاسم کی دامادی دیکھو تقدیر باری بھی
عروس آکر پکر دامن چلے تو شو ہو جب جہو جھن
نشانی کچھہ دیئو منجکن سو پیارا سین تماری بھی

حسین کا وقت جب دانیا شمر نے آگلا کانیا
حرم کا دیکھ سینا پیا دینا اور آپ کاری بھی
یزید دیکھا حسین کا سر پھرایا پپت سوں پھر پھر
سو دیکھو لعنتی کافر کیا کفر اختیاری بھی
کرو اے دوستاں ماتم ثواب ہے بہت کرنا غم
مدد ہو وینگے امام ہردم کی ہے امیدواری بھی
حسین کا دکھ لمیں آن لگا یک چٹ سوں دائم وہاں
کرے قطب عبداللہ سلطاں دو کنوسوں شہریاری بھی

ہاشم علی برہان پوری (۲۵۰ مرثیئے کہے ہیں)

تھا بر اولاد شفیع المذنبیں * ظلم بے حد در جہاں اقسام کا
زخم لاگا مرتضیٰ کے سر اُپر * گر پڑا جوں آفتاب اس ایام کا
زہر دے مارے حسن کوں مکرسیں * سبز تھا وہ چہرہ گلفام کا
کربلا میں تھا حسین ابن علی * آج غم ہے گا انہیں ایام کا

علی عادل شاہ بیجا پور سنہ ۱۹۵۶ ع سے سنہ ۱۹۷۲ ع تک

شہ کے غم سوں دل ہے نالاں ہائے ہائے
جگ بہستی جوں ابھالا ہائے ہائے
جگ کے سرور دل کے لہو سوں بھر چلے
پھور کر پلکھاں کے بالا ہائے ہائے
کربلا کی سب زمیں رنگیں ہوئی
لہو بھرے دلدل کے ماندن ہائے ہائے
اس شدیاں کوں کھول آنکیاں دیک توں
ہے برو شہ کے او دھالاں ہائے ہائے
کر خوشی ہور خرمی کے گر پڑے
آہ کے چھنے میں نالاں ہائے ہائے
نت. کر عادل علی یک دل ستے
شہ کا ماتم ماہ و سالاں ہائے ہائے

غلام علی خاں لطیف

اے اہل درد اشک سوں انکھیاں کو تر کرو
نکلیا ہے پھر یو ما ہے محرم نظر کرو
نازل زمیں پو سرتے ہوا غم حسین کا
ماتم زدہ یاں کواٹک طرفتے خبر کرو
سلطان کربلا کی غریبی کون یاد کر
ٹکڑے جگر کون ہور دلاں خنجر کرو
ہے درد اگر تمن کون قیامت کے دھوپ کا
سایہ کون اہلبیت کے سر کا چھتر کرو
بے دین ہو یزید کیا دین میں خلل
لعنت مدام اس کے اوپر سر بسر کرو
گر شہ علی ہے بات میں ثابت قدم تمین
آیات ہور حدیث ہور سبی میں اثر کرو
آل عبا کے غم سوں جنم آج صرف کر
محشر کے دیس ذوق خوشیا تمن اثر کرو
غواص کے زمانکے اچھہ ہے لطیف تو
اے عارفاں ہو یاد تمہیں یو اچھر کرو

سید میران ہاشمی (وفات سنہ ۱۱۰۹ھ مطابق ۱۶۹۷ع)

دلبند مصطفی کاتابوت لے چلے ہیں
فرزند مرتضی کا تابوت لے چلے ہیں
سلطان دو جہاں کا سردار اولیا کا
مظلوم کربلا کا تابوت لے چلے ہیں
حضرت حسین حسن کا شاہ زمین زمن کا
حضرت نبی کے من کا تابوت لے چلے ہیں
حضرت کے تھے نواسے حیدر کے تھے خلاصے
ہوئے شہید پیاسے تابوت لے چلے ہیں
اے ہاشمی شہاں کا سلطان دو جہاں کا
مقبول اس جہاں کا تابوت لے چلے ہیں

کاظم علی کاظم

(a) تم اپنے دلبراں کی خبر لو علی ولی
(مربع) بے تاج سروراں کی خبر لو علی ولی
نیزوں اوپر سران کی خبر لو علی ولی
ظلم ستم گراں کی خبر لو علی ولی

آرام دل سکینہ بیتاب کون نہیں
انکھیاں میں اسکے راہ خواب کون نہیں
کہیں انتہا یو درد کے اسباب کون نہیں
غم ھائے بے کراں کی خبر لو علی ولی

(b) آج پڑے رن میں بے جان حسینا
ظلم و ستم سون بن نے حیران حسینا
جد کا دل میں لے چلے ارمان حسینا
پائے نہیں اس درد کا درمان حسینا

---

c) پئے نہیں اس حیدر آج پانی
پوکاریں دین کے رھبر آج پانی
کہاں روئے زمیں پر آج پانی
مگر در حوض کوثر آج پانی

دھن سوکھا ھے کاظم غم سون میرا
نہیں یاں آسرا میرا تیرا
قلم کرتا نہیں کاغذ پہ پھیرا
سیاھی کون . نہ رھبر آج پانی

مرزا بیجا پوری

(مربع)

شربعت اساسی پہ اتیا ستم
حقیقت شناسی پہ اتیا ستم
نبی کے نواسے پہ اتیا ستم
سب مت کے آسے پہ اتیا ستم

دیا زہر پانی میں یا ظالماں
سو لاگا کلیجے کون جا کر تدھاں
جگر ٹوٹھہ حسن کا پرا بے گناہ
مدینہ کے باسی پہ اتیا ستم

حسین ابن حیدر خدا کا ولی
جگر گوشۂ فاطمہ اور علی
بروج دہ و دہ کا بدر جلی
شہ کر کہر ایسی پہ اتیا ستم

مبارک بدن سوں ہوا سر جدا
ایسی غم سوں کہتا ہے مرز سدا
کیا کیا دو بدبخت نے اے خدا
شہنشاہ پیاسے پہ اتیا ستم

الودا اے الودا شاہ شہیداں الودا
الودا ابن علی دو جگ کے سلطاں الودا
یو شفق نہیں ہے گگن پر صبح و شام اس درد سوں
نت بھراویں لہو منے دامن گریباں الودا

یہی نہ تنہا لباس نیلا ہے سب محباں کے تن میں غم تھیں
سیاہ پھیرا ہے پتلیوں نے ازل سوں جگ کے نین میں غم تھیں
خبر محباں کی اشک ریزی کی جب بدخشاں سوں گئی عرب میں
عقیق جتنے تھے سب لہو ہوکے بہ چلے ہیں نمن میں غم تھیں

Ram Rao Siva, a famous marsiya-writer, was a contemporary of Mirza. In 1681 A.D. (*i.e.*, 1092 H.) he translated روضة الشهدا into Urdu poetry. It contains all the tragic events that happened at Karbala.

ذوقي متوفي سنه ۱۶۹۸ع

اے شمعِ بزم مرتضیٰ گھر آج آتے کیوں نہیں
تاریک ہے تم بن جہاں جلوہ دکھاتے کیوں نہیں
وہ جاہل و دوزخ وطن آئے ہیں بادل کے نمن
جوں برق تیغ صف شکن شہ جگمگاتے کیوں نہیں
وہ شمعِ بزم مصطفیٰ باد اجل سوں گل ہوا
سب سوز دل سوں تن سدا یاراں گلاتے کیوں نہیں

قاضی محمود بحری متوفی ۱۷۱۸ع

جب شاہ کے وجود مبارک پہ غم ہوا
تب سب جہاں تھے حرف خوشي کا عدم ہوا
بحری مدام شاہ کے ماتم میں یوں گلے
جیوں چاند آسمان پہ گل گل کے کم ہوا

احمد

صلواۃ بر محمد صلواۃ بر محمد
ہر دمبدم ہزاراں صلواۃ بر محمد
یعقوب علي کے گھن کا موتی نبي کے من کا
زہرا فاطمہ کے تن کا صلواۃ بر محمد

ولي ویلوری

Translated روضة الشہرا in Urdu poetry in 1119 A.H. (1707 A. D.) which was published from Bombay in 1291 A. H.

محمد اشرف—اشرف گجراتي

کہاں ہے وہ ولی والی حیدر حسن میراؐ
کہاں ہے وہ حسین ابن علي صفدر شکن میرا

اگن سوں ماتم شہ کے جلا ہے تن بدن میرا
برنگ برق خرمن سوز دل ہے ہر سخن میرا

لگا ہے بسکہ تیر ماتم شہ دل منے کاری
شہید کربلا نے غم ہوا ہے جگ میں من میرا

باذو کہیں اصغر نہیں اب میں جھلاؤں کس کے تئیں
سونا ہوا ہے پالنا اب میں جھلاؤں کس کے تئیں

نہلا کے میں کپڑے پنہا اس کو بنانی گل نمن
وہ پھول سو کھا نیربن اب میں بناؤں کس کے تئیں

سوتا تھا جب وہ نیند بھر پینے اٹھاتی دودہ کون
بیدم ہے دیکھو آج وہ اب میں جگاؤں کس کے تئیں

جب مسکراتا وہ بچا میں شاد ہوتی دل منے
بیجان پڑا ہے گود میں اب میں ہنساؤں کسکے تئیں

محمد رضی—رضی احمدآبادي

غم سوں ہے بیقرار میرا دل
دکھ سوں ہے زار زار میرا دل

گلشنِ غم میں ہے شہیداں کے
لالۂ داغدار میرا دل

غم کی بجلي پڑی ہے جب سیتے
تب سوں ہے شعلہ زار میرا دل

نیم بسمل نمن تڑپتا ہے
ہو کے غم کا شکار میرا دل

گرد غم سوں امام کے اے رضي
کیوں نہ ہو پر غبار میرا دل

اسامی ۱۷۲۵ع

کیا ظالماں نے ظلم کیا بے حساب آج
مظلوم کربلا میں ہیں عالی جناب آج
اس غم سوں مومناں کو ہوا پیچ و تاب آج
گویا علی کے گھر کا کھلا غم کا باب آج
کیوں عرش فرش پر نہ گرا بیقرار ہو
کیوں تاب لاسکے یہ فلک دیکھ ظلم یو
مینا سے قد کو شہ کے شکستہ کیا دیکھو
سنگیں دلاں نے ظلم کی پی کر شراب آج

غلامی ۱۷۲۵ع

اب میں جھلاؤں کسے چھاتی لگاؤں کسے
دودھ پلاؤں کسے ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا
نکلی میں جب از وطن کیسی ہوئی تھی شگن
گم ہوئے سارے رتن ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا
لوہو میں اکبر مرا زخمی بدن ہے پڑا
تن ہوا سب سوں جدا ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا
حال مرا زار ہے جیونا دشوار ہے
عابدیں بیمار ہے ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا
میری سکینہ نڈھال پیاس سوں ہے خستہ حال
کیا کروں اے ذوالجلال ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا
آئی تو آئی کہاں، بیٹی بیاہی کہاں
میرا جوائی کہاں ہے ہے فلک کیا کیا

بانو پہ کربلا میں کیسا یہ دکھ پڑا ہے
گودوں میں پیارا اصغر بن دودھ مر چلا ہے
ہو رانڈ بیٹھی بیٹی داماد مر چکا ہے
سر کا چتر بھی ڈھلتا کوئی دم کو آرہا ہے
سمجھانا اس بچی کو اس وقت کیا مصیبت
بابا بناں تڑپنا اور تشنگی کی شدت

اے بیٹي تیرے بابا کھانے گئے ضیافت
معصوم کا یہ سن کر دہ چند جي جلا ہے
کھنے لگی کہ اماں ہے ہے یہ کیا غضب ہے
مرتي ہوں بھوك سیتیں پیاسوں سے جاں بلب ہے
ضیافت میں گے ہیں بابا مجھہ بن تو کیا سبب ہے
بابا نے مجھہ پہ شاید شفقت کوں کم کیا ہے

قادر ۱۱۴۹ھ مطابق ۱۷۳۶ ع

ہوا شہرہ محرم میں یو غم ہے شاہ عالی کا
کہ ہے فرزند وہ پیارا دونو عالم کے والي کا
چھپا ہے دین کا شہرہ کہ جسکے سوگ سوں جگ پر
فلك پر ملك ہیں تانے شمیانا رات کالي کا
ستارے سب یہ قدسیاں نے ملا کر سب گگن اوپر
حسین کے عرس کو بھاندے منڈف موتیاں کی جالی کا

سیدن

ماہ محرم میں دیکھو ہو چندا مالی آئیا
تارے گگن کے گوند کے سہرا جو شہ کوں لائیا
کنگنا ستم کا باند کر رو کہ کا ابٹا کوں لگا
حیرت کی چوکی کے اُوپر انجھواں سے تن نہلائیا
دولا حسینا چھر ترنگ سر ڈال مکھنا نور کا
سارے براتی سات لے دولھن کوں بھیا نے دھائیا
باجے بجرویں بین کے، غم کے نفریاں کا ہے غل
ملعون لشکر مل سبھی منڈف تیروں کا چھائیا
سیدن سقا شہ کا سرا میدان نر کرنے بدل
نینوں کی مشکاں اشك سوں بھر بھر کے نت چھڑکائیا

روحی

آج غم ناك ہیں چمن کے گل
بلکہ دل چاك ہیں سمن کے گل

غم زدہ سینہ داغ حیراں ہیں
نرگس و لالہ یا سمن کے گل

یوں یہ لالے شفق کے دستے ہیں
لہو میں ڈوبے ہیں سب گگن کے گل

جب سنی شہ کی بات مجلس میں
جل بجھے شمع انجمن کے گل

خوش لگے تجھ طبع سوں اے روحی
دل کے باغاں منے سخن کے گل

نظر

یاراں ہزار حیف رسول خدا نہیں
اور فاطمہ علی و حسن مجتبی نہیں
تنہا حسین رن میں کوئی آشنا نہیں
بازو نہیں رفیق نہیں دلربا نہیں

رمضانی

اس شاہ سروراں کو سرور نہ کہوں تو کیا کہوں
اس ماہ دو جہاں کو انور نہ کہوں تو کیا کہوں

مدحی

یاراں دو جگ کے شاہ پر صلوات سب کہو
معنی لالہ پر صلوات سب کہو

یاد

حضرت نبی اپنے نواسیاں کے خبر لیو
ہے چور رن میں گھائل زخماں کی خبر لیو

ندیم

اے صبا غم کی خبر گھر گھر سوں کہہ
پھر مدینہ میں نبی سرور کو کہہ

مستقیم

تشنہ لب رن میں کیوں آل پیمبر ہوتے
حاضر اس وقت اگر آن ساقی کوثر ہوتے

معصوم

آیا دل محرم سب جا عزا ہوتا ہے
ارض و سما بماتم نیلی قبا ہوتا ہے

شیدا

سواری آج ہے شہ کی دیکھو یاراں محرم سوں
چلے ہیں آہ مظلوماں بہت دکھ درد ماتم سوں

اکبر

ہے ہائے قاسم ہے ہائے قاسم
مارے تجے کیوں ہے ہائے قاسم

صفي

اما ہے شہر ماتم کا رچا ہے بیاہ قاسم کا
شہ سلطان عالم کا رچا ہے بیاہ قاسم کا

As it has all along been a popular belief of Muslims ever since the great tragedy at Karbala took place that lamenting the martyrdom of Husain and his followers is conducive to purification of soul, the marsiyas purposely contained lamentations and briefly narrated the bare facts of the tragedy in simple and pathetic words to move the heart of the hearer. We can see from the instances just quoted that some of them cannot be called a piece of literature but expression of grief tinged with religious feelings. They are devoid of linguistic or rhetoric beauties. They are plain, natural, and moving like the pleading of a child. It was perhaps on this basis that people used to say in those days بگڑا شاعر مرثیہ گو (an unsuccessful poet becomes a marsiya-writer): No doubt the marsiya

devoid of all poetic and rhetoric beauties could easily be composed even by a novice. Uzlat عزلت was the first poet to draw the attention of the composers of marsiya to this point which was endorsed by other poets also.

عزلت

خام مضمون مرثیہ کہنے سوں چپ رہنا بھلا

پختہ درد آمیز عزلت نت توں احوالات بول

Shah Quli Khan Shahi was probably the first man who introduced marsiya in Northern India. He held a high position in the court of Abul Hasan Tana Shah, the last king of Golkunda. After the overthrow of the said kingdom, he was brought and received with great honour by the people of Delhi in 1687 probably. He was very much respected and was regarded as one of the distinguished poets of his age. His compositions induced the Delhi poets and Burhanuddin Asmi appeared on the dais of marsiya-writers. He was one of the first poets from amongst the Dehalvis who composed marsiya—his son Mir Amani was the second to follow him. Mir Amani wrote very pathetic marsiyas. It is said that while he was once reciting his marsiya in a majlis, he was so much impressed with the pathos of his own composition that his voice choked all of a sudden. The audience waited for a minute or two under the impression that he was perhaps making a selection of suitable stanzas to recite, but getting impatient they went up to him and discovered to their utmost surprise and dismay, that excessive shock had stopped the action of his heart and he was no more. Maulana Fazli wrote دہ مجلس in the time of Mohammad Shah in 1728 in Prose. Wali of Deccan sang the martyrdom of Husain and his followers in the form of Masnavi. It should be noted that the marsiyas up till now were written either in مربع or نظم مسلسل like masnavi. But Haider

Shah Haider adopted the form of مسدس for marsiyas. He was contemporary of Wali and flourished in the time of Aurangzeb and Mohammad Shah. Some critics have given this credit to Sikandar and others to Sauda. Mir Mohammad Taqi *alias* Mir Ghasita and many other marsiya-writers followed him. Mian Miskeen gained world-wide fame in this branch of poetry. Mir Taqi Mir and Sauda then appeared on the exalted place of marsiya-writers. Sauda composed very pathetic marsiyas, and won great distinction in this form of poetry which had gained popularity by that time. The Marsiyas of Sauda in particular and his contemporary poets in general show a distinct improvement on those written prior to their appearing on the stage. Sauda's marsiyas are elegantly worded and profoundly pathetic. He composed them almost in all the forms including مسدس and selected suitable metres for them. Some instances of marsiyas composed in Northern India are given below:—

شاہ قلی خاں شاہی

ہائے غریب یتیم نمانے عابد تیری زاری ہے
باپ کا مرنا دکھ کا بھرنا تس پر یوں بیماری ہے
تیغ کھڑی لے دشمن سرپر واویلا دکھ بیماری ہے
درد مصیبت عابد تم پر آج کے دن بسیاری ہے

جبریل کہیں بتلاؤ مجھکو نام ہے کیا اس وادی کا
سنا جب کربل یہی ہے مقتل حسین علی سے ہادی کا
کہا بہشت سے پیام لیا یا عابد تیری دادی کا
کٹھن گھڑی ہو پوتے میرے تجھپر کیا سنگساری ہے

مرزا ابوالقاسم مرزا

کہوں دکھ درد اصغر کا اور نور چشم سرور کا
شہ غازی کے جوہر کا کرو زاری مسلمانان

عزیزان دل ھوا پر خون یو سن اصغر کے ماتم کون
کئے معصوم شہادت سون کرو زاری مسلمانان
حسین اصغر کون منگائے ان کے تیرے تو بسلائے
بزان لشکر کنے لائے کرو زاری مسلمانان
جبتان پر ھانك تب مارے کہے اے سنگہ دلان سارے
برائی میں نہ تم ھارے کرو زاری مسلمانان

ھوئی جب تشنگی غالب امام انس و جان پر
خبر یو سن کے پانی نے آپس میں پیچ کھایا ھے
شہیدان کا لہو پر یا جب کربلائے میناتے
فلك تعظیم سون اس کو شفق کرنے اچایا ھے
ھوا تن سے جدا جب سر شہنشاہ دو عالم کا
گگن سر کات سورج کا شفق کے لہو میں بہایا ھے

محنت قبل کی رات ھے اھل حرم پر گھات ھے
دل چور اس غم سات ھے تیرے فراقوں یا حسین
یوں رات جگ غمناك ھے عالم پو سب دیناك ھے
پر خون جگر دل چاك ھے تیرے فراقوں یا حسین

ولی

(a) غوغا ھوا جھاں میں شہ کے وصال کا
سینے منے پڑا ھے چھالا اس ملال کا
محتاج ھیں جھاں کے صحبان تمام مل
دیدار چاھتے ھیں مبارك جمال کا
جو کوئی کرے زبان سون ادتو کا ورد مدام
ھے یہ ولی خلاصے جواب و سوال کا

(b) اے ھادی سینسار تو کیوں جابسایا کربلا
اے واقف اسرار تو کیوں جا بسایا کربلا

اے نور چشم مصطفیٰ فرزند شاہ مرتضیٰ
اے دلبر خیرالنسا تو کیوں جا بسایا کربلا
تو دوستاں کا جان ہے تیرا ذکر ایمان ہے
تجھ پر ولی قربان ہے کیوں جا بسایا کربلا

(c) اوس نور مصطفیٰ پر بولو سلام یاراں
محبوب مرتضیٰ پر بولو سلام یاراں
اوس پاک پارسا پر حیدر کے دلربا پر
اوس لعل بے بہا پر بولو سلام یاراں
ہو جی ولیؔ فدا کر اوس شاہ کربلا پر
اوس لائق ثنا پر بولو سلام یاراں

مرزا رفیع السودا—سوداؔ

اے امام زماں واویلا سید دو جہاں واویلا
آج تجھ یادگار حیدر کا نہیں جگ میں نشان واویلا
رن میں بے سر پڑا ہے تیرا تن شاہ کون و مکاں واویلا
نازک اندام پر ترے رن میں زخم تیغ و سنان واویلا
جو کہ گذرا ہے تجھ پہ جور و ستم کیا کروں میں بیان واویلا
. . . .
ختم تو کر کے مرثیہ سوداؔ یہی کہہ ہر زماں واویلا

(a) بدن میں زخم ستم رن میں جب اُٹھائے حسین
گرے بروئے زمیں پشت زیں سے ہائے حسین
اُٹھا کے سر یہ کہا تب کہ اے خدائے حسین
جو کچھ کہ تیری رضا ہو سو ہے رضائے حسین

چنانچہ یوں ہے روایت کہ بعد قتل امام
دیا یہ نعش کو روح الامیں نے آکے پیام
کہا ہے حق نے بہ سوگند تجکو بعد سلام
جو کچھ حسین کہے دوں میں خوں بہائے حسین

. . . .

بحق شاد شہیداں ذبح تیغ ستم
الٰہی غم نہ ہو سودا کو چھٹ حسین کے غم
دہووے چشم بھی اسکی بجز محرم نم
جو بعد مرگ ہو مدفن تو کربلائے حسین

(b) آج وہ دن ہے کہ سب اہل جہاں روتے ہیں
جتنے ہیں زیر فلک پیر و جواں روتے ہیں
خاک میں مور جہاں دیکھو تو وہ روتے ہیں
مرغ ہو کر بجہاں بال فشاں روتے ہیں

اولیاؤں میں حواس اور نہ یتیموں میں ہوش
طاقتِ نالہ نہ ان کو نہ انہیں تاب و خروش
سر نگوں گرد محمد کے بہم دوش بدوش
چپکے بیٹھے ہوئے سب خرد و کلاں روتے ہیں

غش سے حوریں تووے بیٹھیں ہیں دیوار کو پشت
سینے کو اپنے ملک کوٹتے ہیں باندہ کے پشت
اور روح الامین افسوس کے مارے انگشت
شمع کی طرح لگا کر بہ دہاں روتے ہیں

. . . .

(c) یارو سنو تو خالق اکبر کے واسطے
انصاف سے جواب دو حیدر کے واسطے
وہ بوسہ گہ بنی تھی پیمبر کے واسطے
یا ظالموں کی برش خنجر کے واسطے

وہ تازگی کو روح نبی کی ہوا تھا خلق
یا اسلئے کہ ذبح کریں اسکو تشنہ خلق
جس سینہ پر مگس ہو تو ہو فاطمہ کو قلق
واں بیٹھے شمر کاٹنے کو سر کے واسطے

(مسدس)

(a) اُس لعیں نے کیا دیکھ کے عابد کو خطاب
کیوں ترا باپ لڑا گر نہ تھی لڑنے کی تاب
ردّ بیعت سے مرے گھر کو کیا اپنے خراب
آپ تو جی سے گیا تجھپہ یہ ڈالا ہے عذاب
ہے گلے طوق ترے پاؤں میں تیرے زنجیر
دیکھتے ہیں تجھے اس حال سے برناؤ و پیر
سنتے ہی اس کو وہ سرور یہ زباں پر لایا
کیا ہوا گردش دوراں سے جو میں دکھ پایا
جو کیا باپ نے میرے وہ خدا کو بھایا
مفت اپنا تو جہنم میں مکاں بنوایا
راہ میں حق کے مرے باپ نے باندھی تھی کمر
گو کہ کاٹا گیا اس راہ میں اب اس کا سر

(b) کس سے اے چرخ کہوں جائے تری بیدادی
ہاتھ سے کون نہیں آج ترے فریادی
جو ہے دنیا میں سو کہتا ہے مجھے ایذا دی
یاں تلک پہونچی ہے ملعون تری جلادی
کوئی فرزند علی پر یہ ستم کرتا ہے
کیوں مکافات سے اس کے تو نہیں ڈرتا ہے
یہ وہ فرزند علی تھا کہ جسے صبح و شام
آکے روح الامیں کرتا تھا مدینے میں سلام
اور کہتے تھے سبھی خرد و کلاں مل کے تمام
جن و انس و ملک و حور کا بیشک ہے امام
اس کو کربل میں کیا ذبح پیاسا ہیہات
کیا دکھاویگا محمد کو تو اب روید ذات

(To be continued)

ASOKA NOTES

By Prof. K. A. Nilkanta Sastri

I

Vivutha

The first point I wish to discuss here is the import of the enigmatic sentence towards the end of the First Minor Rock Edict which in its fullest form as it occurs in the Sahasram version reads :

> *iyam cha savane vivuthena duve sapaṁnā lāti satā vivuthā ti* 200 50 6 (Hultzsch, CII. i. p. 230),

The difficulty of the sentence would be clearly seen if some of the different ways in which it has been translated are set side by side :

(1) 'It is by the missionary that this teaching is spread abroad. Two hundred and fifty-six men have been sent forth on missions, 256.' (Stnart, tr. *IA*. xx, p. 165)

(2) 'And this message has been caused to be proclaimed 256 times by the king on tour.' (R. K. Mookerji, *Aśoka* p. 113, following Brahmagiri version.)

(3) 'And this proclamation (was issued by me) on tour. Two hundred and fifty-six nights (had then been) spent on tour—(in figures) 256.' (Hultzsch, CII. i. p. 171)

(4) 'And this proclamation (was issued) by (me after I had) spent the night (in prayer). Two hundred and fifty-six nights (had then been) spent (in prayer).' (*ibid*. Corrigenda).

I think we may now pass by all interpretations of this sentence which omit to take account of the word *lāti* (night) to which attention was first drawn by F. W. Thomas in 1910

Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar has indeed questioned the validity of the interpretation of Thomas (*IA*. 1912 pp. 171—3). This led V. A. Smith to abandon Thomas' explanation in the third edition of his *Aśoka* (p. 152) though he had accepted it in the second. Bhandarkar's main difficulty in accepting Thomas' view lies in the word *satā* after the figure 256 in the Rupnath text. Prof. Bhandarkar had to handle this vexed question without 'the good fortune', as he puts it, 'of knowing the views of these scholars (Thomas and Lévi) first hand.' But we should note that this difficulty was stated and faced by Thomas. He suggested, I think rightly, that the Sahasram version which gives the number both in words and figures shows the manner in which the superfluous *satā* of the Rupnath version arose.[1] Fleet offered anoter explanation[2] of it. Let us, however, accept for argument's sake that the Rupnath text does constitute a difficulty; what is Prof. Bhandarkar's solution? First, he goes back to the old analysis of Senart in which with some reservations he took *viruthа* to mean 'missionary' or 'messenger,' and, conformably to it, accepted Oldenberg's suggestion that *satā* stood for *sattva*, 'living being, man'. (*IA*. xx p. 162); and secondly, he introduced the word *satā* into the sentence in Sahasram version on the score that it has been 'inadvertantly omitted' there. There is no need to discuss these details at any length, because Senart has himself given up his old views on *Virutha*[3] and *satā*; he has accepted the interpretation of *vivāsa* given by Thomas and Lévi, and their attribution of it to the king and not to his officials or messengers. He differs from them, however, in thinking that *lāti* stands not for 'night', but for *rati* as in Khālsi RE vii F; as his remarks on this matter are

[1] *JA*: 10, 15 (1910). p. 521.

[2] *JRAS* 1911, p. 1104, n. 2.

[3] We may note incidentally that this cuts the ground on which Bhandarkar's suggestion of *Viyutha* at PE. vii M. rests.

brief and important in view of his eminent place in Aśoka studies, and as many Indian students may not have easy access to them, I may translate them here fully for convenient reference (*JA* : 11, 7, May-June, 1916 pp. 434-5) : 'For my part', says Senart, 'I do hot mean in any manner, by the interpretation which I maintain for *prakram* and its derivatives, to drive an argument either against the sense attributed to *vivāsa* by Messrs. Thomas and Lévi, or the application, which is new and very ingenious, they make of it to the king. I should be more disposed in my turn to suggest a more direct confirmation of this. Let us recall the text of (Sahasram) : *dure sapamnā lāti satā vivuthā* ti. After having, very correctly, cut off the numeral noun after *Pamnā*, Messrs. Thomas and Lévi understand *lāti = rātri;* the changes of place by Aśoka would be counted by nights, not by days. Surely, this manner of counting is not, in itself, inadmissible. All the same, in this particular application, it does not fail to excite some surprise. In the VIII Rock-Edict *piyadasī* makes a reference to these 'goings out' or 'rides' which we cannot fail to recall here. There he opposes to the 'pleasure rides' (*vihāra yātrā*), hunts, etc., dear to his predecessors, the *dharmayātrās* which he devotes to pious objects—alms, preachings, inspections; he concludes : *esā bhuya rati bhavati devanampiyasa* : 'Such is (since his conversion) the repeated *rati* (pleasure) of the king dear to the devas'. At Khalsi : *ese bhuye lāti hoti devānampiyasa*. For this use of *rati* we may compare *Dhamm*. v. 64 ; *Sabbam rat im dhammarati Jināti*. The long *ā* of Khalsi has no etymological justification. Has it been favoured by the equivalent *abhilāme* employed at Dhauli and Jaugada ? One thing is sure, *viz.*, that it is attested by the fascimiles. Nothing astonishing that this mode of writing, though faulty, should be found again at (Sahasram)[a] *Lāti*. (*sic*)

[a] Si. for S. here is an obvious misprint in *JA* p. 435.

rati where it would be the curtailed form of *ratiyātrā* or *rativivāsa;* the allusion would relate these changes of place to the king with decisive precision.' I do not find it easy to accept Senart's view, and think that *lāti*=*rāti* (night) is much more probable in the context. The nature of the '*vivāsa*' (living apart) of Aśoka has been much discussed. A religious tour of the duration of 256 days, as many nights spent in prayer, living apart giving up other avocations and observing *brahmacarya* (celibacy), the life of a wandering bhikṣu for one year excluding the rainy season (*vassa*) of three months to be spent in a fixed abode—these are the principal ideas put forward. Sylvain Lévi argued that 256 days constitute 17 fortnights in a year of 360 days of which 18 fortnights (nine months) were the period during which monks had to be on the move; in his zealous exertion (*prakrama*) Aśoka had led the life of a monk performing *Cārika* and wanted to proclaim the fact before the close of his '*wanderjahr*' and address an exhortation to the people asking them to interest themselves in the cause of *Dhaṁma.*[5] Fleet maintained to the end that the Minor Rock Edict was issued by Aśoka towards the close of his life and after he had laid down the imperial office and assumed the robes of a monk; he criticised Lévi's view of the 256 nights briefly summarised above on the score that no calendar known to be in actual use in the Mauryan period corresponds to the year of 24 fortnights assumed by Lévi as the basis of his argument; and he ingeniously reconciled the new interpretation of Thomas with the old view that the number referred to the years that had elapsed from the Buddha's *nirvāṇa*, and said: 'The address was delivered by the royal recluse to members of the order gathered round him in quiet on the 256th night of his withdrawal from the world, because, by living through that night, he was completing in his retirement one day

[5] *JA*: 10, 7 (1911), Jan.—Feb. pp. 120-21.

for each complete year that had elapsed since the death of the founder of the faith the permanence of which he sought to ensure.'[6] But this neat and fascinating explanation of the number 256 is not tenable in the face of the opinion now almost universally held, and for good reason,[7] that the Edict takes a place, not among the last, but the earliest inscriptions of the reign; in fact it preceded the Rock and the Pillar series of edicts. There seems to be no way of accounting for 256 along the line followed by Fleet, even if we substitute the *nirvāṇa* for the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha as the basis of reckoning; for the Buddha is said to have enjoyed a long ministry of forty to forty-five years between his *nirvāṇa* and *parinirvāṇa*, and 256 years after the *nirvāṇa* might barely bring us to Aśoka's reign which began 214 years after the *parinirvāṇa* or not even that if we accept the longer ministry.

It seems to me that, in spite of the objections of Fleet based on the difference of a few days, the explanation advanced by Sylvain Lévi is the best way of accounting for the number 256. This period of 256 days should be taken to have been included in the year and more during which he had visited the *saṁgha* and been very zealous (*sātileke tu chavachare ya sumi hakam sagha upete baḍhi ca pakate*—Rupnath). That Aśoka meant to say that he spent so many nights in prayers appears to me inadequate and improbable; the choice lies between the life of a wandering mendicant monk for a whole *cārika* season as Lévi has suggested, or more simply, the life of a religious recluse separated from family and cut off from worldly business for the same period followed by a return to normal secular avocations at the end of it. Perhaps those two senses need not be treated as mutually exclusive, and it may be assumed that besides a life of *brahmacarya* and

[6] *JRAS*: 1910, p. 1308.
[7] Hultzsch, p. xliv.

temporary abstraction from worldly duties, Aśoka was also moving from place to place so far as this was practicable or necessary for the purpose he had in view which will become clear in the next note; it is not easy to assume that there were 256 changes of the place of sojourn or a continuous tour of 256 days.

It is perhaps worth noting here that words formed from the root *vi-vas* cannot all be treated as having precisely the same meaning; the general import of 'going out' or 'living apart' always being granted, its exact application may vary with the context. Thus (1) '*vivasatavāya*' may mean 'be sent on official tour' (MRE. Rupnath L); for here the king is thinking of means of promoting among his subjects zeal for *dhaṁma*—one method is to write the edicts on pillars and the other is to send officials on tour within the area of their jurisdiction. I am unable to accept Lévi's suggestion (p. 121, *loc. cit.*) that Aśoka commended to all his subjects the life of a wandering monk as the ideal. (2) *Vivāsayātha* in the edict on Saṁgha-bheda-Sarnath (I), and *vivāsāpayātha* in (J) of the same edict must be understood to mean respectively 'expel' and 'cause to expel.' In spite of the identical wording of Sarnath (I) and Rupanath (L), the only notable difference being in the forms derived from *vi- vas*), I am unable to accept Hultzsch's view (corrigenda to CII.) that in both these records we must understand the words in the same sense of expelling Schmismatic monks or nuns of whom there is, and can be, no talk yet in the Rupnath version of the Minor Rock Edict.

II

Was Aśoka a monk and monarch at the same time and for the whole of his reign after the events recorded in the opening sections of Minor Rock Edict? Very few will now be prepared to maintain the view of Fleet that

the edict is one of the last records of the king issued after his abdication and very near the end of his life. But in the reaction against Fleet's views, Vincent Smith clearly went a little too far and in this he has been followed by others.

Vincent Smith says: 'The fact is undoubted that Aśoka was both monk and monarch at the same time. The belief held by some learned writers that he had abdicated before he assumed the monastic robe is untenable, being opposed to the plain testimony of the edicts. We have seen that the earliest of them, unquestionably issued by Aśoka as sovereign, expressly states that at the time of issue (B.C. 257) he had been for more than a year exerting himself strenuously as a member of the Buddhist *Saṁgha*, or Order of Monks, the organized monastic Church, of which the sovereign had assumed the headship. Throughout his reign he retained the position of Head of the Church and Defender of the Faith. His latest proclamations, the Minor Pillar Edicts, issued at some time during the last ten years of the reign, exhibit him as actively engaged in protecting the Church against the dangers of schism and issuing his orders for the disciplinary punishment of schismatics. In the Bhābrū Edict, seemingly of early date, we find him describing himself as 'King of Magadha', and using his royal authority in order to recommend to his subjects seven favourite passages selected by himself from the sacred books. That edict was recorded on a boulder within the precincts of a monastery on the top of a hill in Rajputana, and the presumption is that the sovereign was residing in the monastery when he issued the orders, which are on record there only. A copy of the Minor Rock Edict I in which he gives a summary of his early religious history is engraved on a rock at the foot of another hill close by. The inscriptions give no support to the late legends which represent the

F. 8

great emperor as a dotard in his old age, and suggest that he adbicated his sovereign functions. His authentic records shown him to have been the same man throughout his career from 257 to the end, a zealous Buddhist, and at the same time a watchful, vigorous, autocatirc ruler of Church and State.' (*Aśōka*, pp. 35-36.)

Sir Charles Eliot, closely following Smith, goes even farther and asserts that Aśoka was more monk than monarch. He says: 'It may be objected that no one could be a monk and at the same time govern a great empire: it is more natural and more in accordance with Indian usage that towards the end of his life an aged king should abdicate and renounce the world. But Wu Ti, the Buddhist Emperor of China, retired to a monastery twice in the course of his long reign and the cloistered Emperors of Japan in the 11th and 12th centuries continued to direct the policy of their country, although they abdicated in name and set a child on the throne as titular ruler. The Buddhist church was not likely to criticize Aśoka's method of keeping his monastic vows and indeed it may be said that his activity was not so much that of a pious emperor as of an archbishop possessed of exceptional temporal power. He definitely renounced conquest and military ambitions and appears to have paid no attention to ordinary civil administration which he perhaps entrusted to Commissioners; he devoted himself to philanthropic and moral projects "for the welfare of man and beasts" such as lecturing his subjects on their duties towards all living creatures, governing the Church, building hospitals and stupas, supervising charities and despatching missions. In all his varied activity there is nothing unsuitable to an ecclesiastical statesman: in fact he is distinguished from most popes and prelates by his real indifference to secular aspirations and by the unusual facilities which he enjoyed for immediately putting his ideals

into practice." (*Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. I, p. 265.)

Now the ideas underlying titles like Head of the Church and Defender of the Faith do not easily fit into the scheme of Indian religious thought and organisation, and while Smith at least concedes that the state claimed Aśoka's attention in an equal measure with the Church, Eliot implies that the pursuit of philanthropic and moral projects left Aśoka little time for the ordinary civil administration. Great as is the value of the inscriptions for our understanding of Aśoka and his government, we should not lose hold of the fact 'that his edicts are not concerned with public affairs, but are of an almost purely religious character' (Hultzch). In fact, they represent only one side, doubtless in some ways the most important side, but still only one side, of Aśoka's administration and policy. He was actuated by a high moral purpose, and his edicts are calculated to stress this new purpose, lay bare its implications for the conduct of the officials of government and the people, and review the administrative innovations rendered necessary by it. They should on no account be treated as the complete history of the reign. But what is the evidence on which these far-reaching speculations on the nature of Aśoka's rule are based? First, there are the words in the Minor Rock inscription which in the different versions read:

Rupnath: *hakam sagha upete*
Bairat: *mamayā saghe (u)payāte*
Maski: *(s)agha(ṁ) u(pa)gate*
Brahmagiri: *mayā saṁghe upayīte*
Siddhapura: *(mayā saṁ)ghe upayīte*
Yeṟṟaguḍi: *mayā saṁgha upayīte*

The only other evidence for Aśoka's renunciation is that of I-tsing who mentions an image of Aśoka dressed in the robes of a Buddhist monk. This is explained below.

A—In the interpretation of the phrase cited above from the Minor RE, Bühler and Senart are the protagonists of rival views.. Bühler has argued that this phrase should be taken to stand in contrast to the earlier statement about Aśoka having become an *upāsaka* (lay-worshipper) and must therefore imply a regular imitation as a monk, a *pabbajā*. Senart has objected that the expression *Saṁghaṁ upa-i* is too vague to imply such a precise idea and not sanctioned by the technical terminology of Buddhism which must have become fixed very early in such a matter. He interpreted the expression in a more literal sense, and held that Aśoka paid a state visit to the *Saṁgha*. He also compared this visit mentioned in the edicts to the account given by the Ceylonese chronicles of the festival of the consecration of Aśoka's 84,000 stupas at which the king is stated to have 'stood in the midst of the Saṁgha.' (Hultzch, pp. xliv—xlv).

In commenting on the Maski edict, Senart reiterated his view that the situation of a king turning monk while retaining the life and prerogatives of royalty is incompatible with the idea we have of ancient monachism, and suggested that *saṁghaṁ upagata* should be taken to signify some step implying adherence and deference to the *Saṁgha*, which might be repeated from time to time and was but the beginning of a close association which was to be habitual and long standing.[8] And this is very much to the point.

But I think it is not necessary to leave the matter so vague. The verb *upa-ī* (*gaṁ* has the same meaning as *i* and is used but once) has a number of meanings, but the one most suitable to our context seems to be 'to approach a teacher', 'become a pupil' (Monier-Williams). What Aśoka means to say in the whole passage at the beginning

[8] *JA*. 11.7 (1916) May-June, pp. 436-7.

of the MRE becomes very clear if we apply this meaning of *upa-i* to explain his relation to the *Saṁgha;* and as Senart has shrewdly remarked, the other meaning of *pravrajyā* (ordination) does not admit of degrees or differences in quality; a man either enters the order or he does not; but if he goes to some person or institution to learn, he may do it well or ill according to his inclination and interest. Here are the exact words of the text (Rupnāth):

(*A*) *Devānampiye hevam āhā* (*B*) *Sātirekāni aḍhatiyāni va*(*sāni*) *ya sumi prakāsa sake* (*C*) *no cu bāḍhi pakate* (*D*) *sātileke tu chavachare ya sumi hakaṁ sagha upete bāḍhi ca pakate.*

which Hultzsch translates: '(A) *Devānāṁpriya* speaks thus (B) Two and a half years and somewhat more (have passed) since I am openly a Śākya (C) But (I had) not been very zealous. (D) But a year and somewhat more (has passed) since I have visited the *Saṁgha* and have been very zealous'.

My present suggestion is that the visit to the *Saṁgha* was made definitely for the purpose of *Dharma-Śravaṇa;* Aśoka went as a pupil eager to learn. The *Dīpavamsa* (VI, 57ff.) says that soon after his conversion by *Nigrodha,* Aśoka heard from him that there were many learned *Arahats* in the *Saṁgha* and said at once: "I desire to meet with that precious Assembly; I will pay my respect to all (Bhikṣus) who come to the Assembly; *I will listen to the Dhamma.*" In the first revulsion from war and its atrocities seen in the conquest of Kaliṅga, Aśoka proclaimed himself a Buddhist (*prakāsa saka*); but then he did little more, and things went on as before for over a year—a very natural and common human situation; Aśoka then pulled himself up from sinking into lassitude, and took steps actively to secure his own moral advancement and those of his people; and he himself explains the nature of

these steps elsewhere, and says that after the conquest of Kaliṅga, he devoted himself to *tive dhaṁmavaye dhaṁmakāmatā dhaṁmānuṣathi cā* (Kalsi RE XIII C) *i.e.*, zealous study of morality, the love of morality, and the instruction of people in morality. And where should Asoka get the aid he needed in the study of *dhamma* better than from the members of the *Saṁgha*? So that Asoka going to the *Saṁgha* should be contrasted, not with his having been an *upāsaka* (lay worshipper) as Bühler suggested, but with his earlier lack of zeal, his failure to further by active steps the cause he had openly embraced after the conquest of Kaliṅga.

It is possible that the *vivāsa* discussed in the last note began with the approach to the *Saṅgha* for hearing *Dhamma*, that the period of 256 days mentioned at the end of the edict has reference to the period spent in the first instance in the study of *Dhamma* as a zealous pupil of the *Saṁgha*. Prof. R. K. Mookerji[9] holds that Aśoka's position is best described as that of a *bhikkhugatika*, intermediate between an *upāsaka* and *bhikkhu* and that he might have chosen to don the robes of a monk during his temporary visits to the *Saṁgha*. We may accept the second suggestion of Prof. Mookerji as a plausible explanation of the image of Aśoka in monastic robes seen by I-tsing centuries later; but there is no ground for ascribing the status of *bhikkhugatika* to Aśoka; for there is nothing either in the inscriptions or in tradition that can be taken to support such a view. In the inscriptions we have nothing but the phrase *saṁgham upete* and tradition is clear that he was only an *upāsaka*, though a very devoted one, to the very end.

The parallel cases of the Chinese emperor Wu-ti cited by Smith and Eliot and that of Amoghavarṣa, the Jaina

---

[9] *Aśoka*, pp. 23, 109-10.

monarch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa line, rest on explicit evidence, and afford no help in elucidating the position of Aśoka. Those monarchs renounced and resumed civil life by turns. Smith indeed argues that 'Aśoka could have done the same,'[10] but that would be different from the case he has sought to establish, *viz.*, 'that both, Aśoka and Wu-ti succeeded somehow in combining the duties of monk and monarch.'[11]

B—The argument has been advanced that Bhikṣus and Bhikṣuṇis often figure as donors in inscriptions, and that consequently ordination was no bar to the pursuit of secular avocations, the ownership of property, the exercise of power, and so on. But this is a misreading of the evidence; the mention of the names of monks and nuns as donors simply means that they were instrumental in the collection of small donations that were accumulated and then used up in the manner indicated. The rules of the Order regarding individual ownership of property were rather strict (*SBE* xiii, pp. 26 and 235), and we have no reason to assume lightly that they were usually disregarded. It is too much to believe that Aśoka was a monk when he spoke of his women and fixed the menu of his court as he does in his inscriptions.

Neither the Calcutta-Bairat (Bhābhrū) inscription nor the edict regarding *saṁghabheda* can be cited to justify the view so alien to all known Indian thought and tradition that Aśoka made himself Head of the Church. A church in the strict sense of the term, organised on hierarchical lines, is altogether unknown to any of the Indiañ religious sects; the use of the term church to describe the *Saṁgha* can be justified only as a vague and loose designation for the order, which comprised an infinite number of independent *vihāras* which indeed owned a common allegiance to

---

10 *Aśoka*, p. 38.
11 *Ib.* p. 37.

the Buddha and the *Dhaṁma* and the *Saṁgha*, but regulated themselves each according to their own views of the *Dharma* and *Vinaya*. The Bhābhrū edict does not necessarily mean either that Aśoka used his royal anthority to recommend to his subjects the seven passages of sacred scripture cited in it or that Aśoka lived at the time as a monk in the monastery near which the edict was engraved. This unique edict is in the form of a letter from the king addressed to the *Saṁgha*, and for aught we know, it migrt well have been a circular letter addressed to all the important monasteries in the empire; it might have been engraved at *Bairat* not so much by the initiative of the king as by that of the head of the particular monastery, and far from asserting royal authority, the letter is couched in the most respectful terms and ends with the statement: 'I desire, sir, that many groups of monks and (many) nuns may repeatedly listen to these expositions of the *Dharma*, and may reflect (on them). In the same way both laymen and laywomen (should act). For the following (purpose), Sirs, am I causing this to be written (*viz.*) in order that they may know my intention'. This edict is no more than a record of opinion on the part of the emperor made at the conclusion of his *dharma-śravaṇa* in which he commends to the clergy and the laity seven passages in scripture that have made the greatest impression on his mind, the frequent exposition and meditation of which, he thinks, would be most conducive to the promotion of *Dharma*. Surely this expression of opinion on the part of the great king after so much study and reflection on his part must have been received with all the deference it merited; but we can hardly consider this as an instance of the use of royal authority, for so sensitive a ruler as Aśoka could not have imagined that enforced preaching and meditation would lead to any good.

In fact the Bhābhrū edict may be taken to provide a

peep into one side of Aśoka's plans for the propagation of *Dharma* within his realms of which we might have known nothing otherwise. He wanted to secure the constant and active co-operation of the *Saṁgha* in his effort to promote *Dharma* among the people; in his other edicts we see how he employed his official staff for this purpose; this edict shows the lines on which he thought the members of the *Saṁgha* could best assist in this great and good enterprise.

To turn now to the other edict regarding *Saṁgha-bheda*. With greater justification we can speak here of the exercise of royal authority, for the edict in plain terms orders the officials of the civil administration to see that within their respective jurisdictions all schismatic monks are expelled from the *Saṁgha*, compelled to wear white robes, and to live in places not suited for the residence of monks. But once more, the talk of Aśoka taking this step as Head of the Buddhist Church appears to me to be misplaced. The late N. G. Mazumdar has discussed this inscription with great acumen in the *Monuments of Sāñchī*, bringing together all the literary evidence available on the Third Council held in Asoka's reign and correlating them with this edict. Following tradition, he points out, rightly, that Aśoka's liberality to the *Saṁgha* had led to abuses, and the *Saṁgha* ran real risk of being overrun by thousands of impostors and heretics who came crowding in for the sake of the income and the comforts which the emperor's liberality had caused to be provided for the members of the order. The best monks were shocked by the behaviour of these unruly elements, and withdrew from the regular monasteries to solitary spots in search of peace. Something had to be done to stop the rot, purge the *Saṁgha* of the intruders and restore its purity. The Third Council was held and the Schismatics expelled; but a rule had to be made, and vigilantly enforced to prevent

the recurrence of the evil. And this required the co-operation of the *Saṁgha* and the king. Majumdar is right when he says :[12] 'If promulgated by the *Saṁgha*, this order might have been easily flouted. It was, therefore, natural that the Saṅgha should approach the highest temporal authority for enforcing it on the fraternity.' But when he says further: 'In the three Edicts (Sārnāth, Kauśāmbī, Sāñchī—really three versions of one edict) Aśoka thus appears as a champion of Buddhism and Head of the Buddhist Church, bent upon preventing schism in the Order,' we are inclined to say: Champion of Buddhism, yes; Head of the Buddhist Church—by no means. For Aśoka would have enforced with equal alacrity similar resolutions of other bodies and groups, religious and secular, had they felt the need for invoking his aid against recalcitrant mischief-makers. It was the well-recognised duty of the Indian State in those days to keep the ring for the innumerable autonomous associations in the land to carry on their work along lines laid down by custom modified by their own regulations made from time to time to meet new contingencies as they arose Majumdar himself points out that Aśoka honoured all sects and that they should uniformly prosper (RE. XII), and observes: 'This liberal spirit is quite in contrast with the rigid sectarian attitude revealed by the Edicts of Sāñchī, Sārnāth and Kauśāmbī.' The contrast imagined is altogether illusory and arises only out of his unwarranted assumption that Aśoka acted as Head of the Buddhist Church, while he was only doing his duty as king.

That Aśoka did not take orders soon after his acceptance of the Buddhist faith may be seen from a statement attributed to him in the *Mahāvaṃśa*, that is, if we may believe that the chronicle, in spite of the long period that separates its composition from the age of Aśoka, may

[12] *Monuments of Sāñchi*, i. p. 286.

still be accepted as representing the correct tradition on the matter. There were exchanges of embassies between the Ceylonese ruler Devānāmpiyatissa and Aśoka. The first mission was sent from Ceylon soon after the accession of Devānāmpiyatissa, and it returned after an honoured stay of five months in the Mauryan capital together with a return embassy from Aśoka. Aśoka's envoys brought with them not only valuable presents to be used in a fresh consecration of Devānāmpiyatissa, but they brought also 'the gift of the true doctrine' in the form of a message from Aśoka, saying: 'I have taken refuge in the Buddha, his Doctrine and his Order, I have declared myself a lay-disciple in the religion of the Śākya son; seek then even thou, O best of men, converting thy mind with believing heart, refuge in these best of gems.'[13] This was in the seventeenth or eighteenth year after Āśoka's *abhiṣeka;* and the reference to the gift of the true doctrine cannot fail to remind one of the praise of *dhamma-dāna* as the best of all gifts in Aśoka's edicts, just as the terms of the message recall Aśoka's profession of faith in the *tri-ratna* in the Bhābhrū edict; and his description of himself as a lay-disciple tallies with the statement in the Minor Rock Edict that he became 'an open Sake, (*pakāsa Sake*) according to the Rūpnāth version, or *upāsake* in Sahasram and Mysore versions,—coincidences which go far to set at rest all doubt about the authenticity of the *Mahāvaṃśa* tradition. If Aśoka was only a lay disciple in the seventeenth year after his *abhiṣeka*, surely he did not become a monk soon after his conversion, and the phrase *Saṁgham upa-ī* cannot be so interpreted.

I-tsing's mention of an image of Aśoka in monastic robes calls for an adequate explanation. This may be found in one of the two ways. First, Aśoka may be taken

---

[13] *MV*. xi. 27—36.

to have worn monastic robes whenever he went to the *Saṁgha* for listening to the expositions of *Dhamma*, an act of courtesy to the members of the order from whom he got so much good instruction, and the image might have commemorated this. Or, secondly, Aśoka may have turned monk towards the end of his life after laying down the burden of imperial administration. And this supposition is supported by a little known passage in the *Divyāvadāna* which occurs in the *Aśokavarṇāvadāna*. It takes the form of a prophecy by the Buddha regarding the future births of a bull. After several divine existences, the bull would be born as a *cakravarti*, Aśokavarṇa by name. He will rule the entire earth in a *dhārmic* way and at the close of his life he will make many gifts, lay down the tasks of administration, renounce the world and take holy orders, and in due course become a *pratyekabuddha*. Here is the text: *rāj ā bhaviṣyaty Aśokavarṇo saptu-ratnasamanvāgataḥ . . . . sa imāmeva anutpīḍām adaṇḍe-mahāprithivīm akhilāṁ akaṇṭakām anutpīḍām abaṇḍe-nāśastreṇa dharmeṇa samayenābhinirjitya adhyavatsyati. So pareṇa samayena dānāni dattvā cakravartirājyam apahāya keśaśmaśrūṇyavatārya kaṣāyāṇi vastrāṇi samy-ageva śraddhayā' gārādanagārikām pravrajya pratyekam bodhim ṣākṣāt kariṣyaty Aśokavarṇo nāma pratyekabuddho bhaviṣyati.*

III

Next I turn to the story of Kuṇāla and Tiṣyarakṣitā which is considered by Keith to be the gem of the *Divyādāna*. The outline of the story is well known; the charming youth Kuṇāla, so called for the particular beauty of his eyes, rejects with firmness and scorn, the illicit advances of his step-mother, who contrives, during Kuṇāla's absence at Taxila, to forge a letter in Aśoka's name ordering the blinding of Kuṇāla as the king had found

him guilty of reprehensible conduct towards him; the sentence is carried out, the blinded Kuṇāla wanders as a ministrel in the company of his wife, till he reaches Pātaliputra, is sent for by Aśoka who recognises his voice and learns from him the truth. Kuṇāla then recovers his sight by a miracle, and Aśoka burns Tiṣyarakṣitā alive disregarding the pleadings of Kuṇāla on her behalf.

The literary power that marks the narration of this story in the *Avadāna* and in later works, Kṣemendra's *Avadānakalpalatā* for instance, is undeniable; and it makes a wide popular appeal in the telling of it and on the screen. But is it history? I think that only the names of Kuṇāla and Aśoka are historical, and all the rest of it legend. I reach this conclusion because the whole story turns upon a *motif* familiar in folklore, the vengeance of women whose love is scorned. See *Jātaka* 472, and Rouse's tr. IV, p. 117 n.3. Edmund Hardy, *King Aśoka*, pp. 66-7 also has a critique of the Kuṇāla story. And the suspicion roused by this fact becomes a certainty when we consider the name of the queen. Let me explain.

Not many words are necessary to support the first part of this argument. The reader may be referred to Penzer's valuable note on 'Women whose love is scorned' (*Ocean of Story*, Vol. 2, pp. 120—124) where several instances of the *motif* are cited and discussed, and the conclusion is reached: 'Thus we see that, in order for a story to be classified under the heading of this *motif*, the woman must make the suggestion, be repulsed, and seek revenge. This is the natural sequence of events which has proved so popular in every part of the East, whence it has travelled slowly westward.' The *Divyāvadāna* which is among the earliest records of this story may be taken to date from the second century A.D., some five to six cen-

turies after the time of Aśoka to which it relates; even so it happens to count among the earliest specimens of this *motif* as can be seen from Mr. Penzer's instances. But the distance of time that separates the narrative from the time of its supposed original occurrence is doubtless a real obstacle in the way of the story being accepted for fact.

The name Tiṣyarakṣitā means literally 'A woman protected by (the asterism) *Tiṣya*.' Now, as is well known, there is a certain emphasis laid on this *nakṣatra* in the edicts of Aśoka, and Fleet who drew attention to it, held that Aśoka's coronation took place on a *Tiṣya* day. He said : 'The fifth pillar-edict directed that on the full-moon day when the moon would be in *Tiṣya* (the full moon of *Pauṣa*), fish were not to be either killed or sold, animals found in elephant-preserves and in the fishermen's reserves were not to be killed, bulls and certain other animals were not to be castrated, and horses and oxen were not to be branded. The first separate edict at Dhauli and Jaugaḍa directed that that proclamation should be read under each *Tiṣya nakṣatra*, and on any suitable occasions-during the intervals. And the second separate edicts at the same places ordered the reading of that proclamation on each occurrence of *Tiṣya* during the *cāturmāsya*-period, and, at pleasure, on any suitable occasions meanwhile. In view of the point established by astrological and other works, that the conjunction of the moon with *Puṣya* (*Tiṣya*) was a specially auspicious one for the anointment of kings, we can hardly fail to recognise something very marked in these allusions to that constellation, otherwise not easily to be understood. in the edicts of Aśoka.[14] Whether Aśoka was crowned on a *Tiṣya* day, or he was born on such a day, it is not unreasonable to think that

---

[14] *JRAS*. 1909, p, 31.

Tiṣya in such a name as Tiṣyarakṣitā simply stands for Aśoka. So that the queen's name simply comes to mean 'protected by Aśoka' which is hardly a personal name, but just an almost transparent mask for a flagrant invention. It will be remembered that Saṁghamitrā, 'the woman-friend of the Order,' the name of Aśoka's daughter by Devi, according to the Ceylonese books, has been likewise held by some to be an invention.

But though the tragic story of Kuṇāla and Tiṣyarakṣitā seems thus to melt into thin air at the slightest touch of criticism, Kuṇāla himself is a real person known to history whose existence is vouched for by the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas, though we know little of him besides his name and his relation to Aśoka.

IV

Aśoka and Ceylon.

The Ceylonese chronicles ascribe the introduction of Buddhism in Ceylon to Aśoka's son and daughter, Mahendra and Saṁghamitrā, whom he had allowed to join the *Saṁgha* in order that he might be hailed as kinsman of the Buddha's religion (*Sāanadāyāda MV*. V. 193—7). They also state that Aśoka and his contemporary in Ceylon, Devānāṁpiya Tissa, were great friends though they had never met, and record two missions from Ceylon to Pāṭaliputra—one of which brought back as presents from Aśoka all the materials necessary for a royal consecration with which Tissa performed a second *abhiṣeka*, and the other fetched the *therī* Saṁgamitrā and a branch of the Bo-tree to Ceylon.

V. A. Smith[15] is inclined to distrust the whole of this story. With Oldenberg he is sceptical about the tale of Saṁghamitrā the supposed daughter of Aśoka, because

[15] *Aśoka*, pp. 44—50.

her name 'friend of the order' is a transparent invention. He thinks it much more likely that the conversion of Ceylon was a work of time, 'the fruit of long and continuous intercourse between Ceylon and the adjacent parts of India, rather than the sudden result of direct communication with Magadha.' And he accounts for the deliberate omission in the chronicles of all mention of Aśoka's missions to the Tamil countries by the hostility between the Sinhalese and Tamils in later times and by the desire of the Ceylonese monks to avoid any suggestion that Buddhism spread to Ceylon from the Tamil country. He says: 'The omission of the Tamil countries of Southern India may be ascribed to the secular hostility between the Sinhalese and the Tamils of the mainland, which naturally would indispose the oppressed Sinhalese to recognise the ancestors of their oppressors as having been brothers in the faith. The island monks were eager to establish the derivation of their religion direct from Magadha through the agency of Mahendra and his supposed sister, and had no desire to recall the by-gone days of friendly intercourse with the hated Tamils. Sound principles of historical criticism require that when the evidence of the inscriptions differs from that of later literary traditions, the epigraphic authority should be preferred without hesitation, and there is no reason to doubt the reality of the missions to the Tamil kingdoms of the south.'[16]

In this argument we may at once agree to two points put forward by Smith as quite probable—*viz.*, first, that Buddhism spread to Ceylon from South India and formed the natural sequel of the extension of the faith throughout India, and secondly, the hostile relations between the Sinhalese and the Tamils at a later time might have induced the authors of the chronicles to minimise and even suppress the rôle of South India in

---

[16] *Aśoka*, p. 44-45.

this process. But is Smith justified in assuming a conflict between the inscriptions of Aśoka and the later literary tradition of Ceylon? The second Rock Edict on the provision of hospitals for men and animals, and the thirteenth in the section on religious missions sent by Aśoka to foreign lands contain the phrase *ā* (*ava or avam*) *Tambapamṇi*, which means 'up to Tambapaṇi.' Smith says that this phrase indicates that the river is meant, not Ceylon (p. 162). I do not see how Taprobane as the name of Ceylon was evidently known to Megasthenes and in Pali literature Tambapaṇṇi is used in no other sense. The suggestion has been made[17] that *Ā Tambapamṇi* of RE II (Girnar) should be taken to stand for *Yā Tāmbraparṇi* and translated 'what is (known as) Tāmraparṇī'; but this is not correct in the face of the alternative forms *ava or avam Tambapamṇi* (cf. RE XIII), and we must Sanskritise the phrase as *ā* (*yāvat*) *Tāmraparṇī;* but there is nothing here to indicate that a boundary like a river is meant. I am inclined to interpret the phrase as I have done above, as meaning 'up to and including Tambapamṇī, the island;' thus once more, tradition and epigraphy are seen to state the same facts in different ways. Smith has himself commented on Hiuen Tsang's mention of a Mahendra monastery at Hadura, saying: 'This interesting passage which shows how vivid the traditions of Aśoka and his brother continued to be in the south after the lapse of nine centuries, and locates Mahendra in a monastery to the south of the Kāverī, within easy reach of Ceylon, goes a long way to support the hypothesis that Mahendra really passed over to the island from a southern part on the mainland."[18]

---

17 R. K. Mookerji, *Aśoka*, p. 132.

18 Smith, *Aśoka*, pp. 49-50.

DHARMOPANIṢAD IN MAHĀBHĀRATA

By Dr. S. M. Katre

In the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata*[1] I. 1,69 we have a reference to the compound expression *dharmopaniṣad* which has not been recorded so far in any Sanskrit lexicon, including the two great *Petersburg Dictionaries* or the *Nachträge* of Schmidt. The same expression occurs again in the interpolated passage 32[1] of the *Ādiparvan*, but beyond this, on a first reading, I have not been able to trace any other reference to it. The verse in question reads as follows:

mātror abhyupapattiś ca dharmopaniṣadam prati
Dharmasya vāyoḥ śakrasya devayośca tath āśvinoḥ
(I. 1. 69).

Devabodha, the earliest known commentator on the Great Epic[2], has the following scholium on the above passage[3] explaining it: *Mātroḥ* Kuntī-Mādryoḥ *dharmopaniṣadam* dharmarahasyam *prati abhyupapattiḥ* sarvātmanā pravṛttiḥ; dharmopaniṣadsambandhino darśayati: *Dharmasya* iti. Devabodha disposes of the expression *dharmopaniṣad* by equating °-*upaniṣad* with its well-known synonym °-rahasyam which can be traced back to Upaniṣadic literature itself.[4]

Nīlakaṇṭha, the latest of the Mahābhārata commenta-

---

[1] *Ādiparvan*, for the first time critically edited by Vishnu S. Sukhankar, M.A., Ph.D., Poona, 1927-33, with the co-operation of several scholars.

[2] Sukthankar, *Epic Studies V*, "Notes on *Mahābhārata* commentators." *Annals BORI* 17. 155-202.

[3] Edited by R. N. Dandekar, Poona 1940, p. 9.

[4] Jacob, *A Concordance of the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgītā*, p. 786 under *rahasya*.

tors, has the following gloss on this passage: *Mātror* iti; *ca*-śabdo hetau. Yasmād *dharmopaniṣadam prati-dharmaḥ* kulastrībhir āpady apatyārthe viśiṣṭaḥ pumān prārthanīya ity-evamrūpo Vyāsa-Vaśiṣṭhādibhyo'napatyavàtsu Vicitravīrya-Kalmāṣapādādirājadāreṣu dṛṣṭaḥ, tasya samraksaṇārthā *upaniṣad*: Durvāsasā dattā vidyā tāṃ (dharmopaniṣadam) āvartitāṃ Dharmādīnām mātroḥ mātarau *prati abhyupapattiḥ*. According to him, therefore, *dharmopaniṣad* indicates the *upaniṣad* or 'secret knowledge' given by the sage Durvāsas for the observance of (*āpad*)*dharma* 'begetting of children through supermen or superior beings' under extraordinary circumstances incapicitating the lawful husbands from exercising their natural rights.

The context of the *Anukramaṇī adhyāya* is explained in Chapter 109 in the *Sambhava* subsection of the *Ādiparvan*. Pāṇḍu goes out hunting once and observes a pair of deer in copulation and he strikes them with five razor-like arrows, wounding them mortally. Now it happens that this pair of deer in reality was a hermit couple who had assumed the form of deer in order to copulate. In human voice the male deer curses Pāṇḍu for his wicked deed, after an interesting conversation on the nature of the deed, in which several salient ethical points are discussed by the *Ṛṣiputra* and Pāṇḍu.. This curse prevents Pāṇḍu from cohabiting with his wives, for such a copulation will bring about his own end, just as he brought the end of the deer in the very act of copulation. As a result of this curse Pāṇḍu leaves his kingdom for the forest where he is followed by his wives, and practises severe ascetic disciplines.

It is at this juncture that other ascetics advise him of the fate of childless parents which prevents them from reaching heaven. As a result of this discussion Pāṇḍu is overcome with dejection, remembering the curse of the

deer. So he calls Kuntī privately and explains his desire for progeny so that his austerities may not become fruitless. His appeal is couched in many fine dharmaśāstra arguments on the types of children, and in conclusion he says:

uttamād *avarāḥ puṁsaḥ* kāṅkṣante *putram āpadi*
(I. 111. 30[cd].)

and recalling his own incapacity to beget children, requests her:

sadṛśāc chreyaso vā tvam viddhy apatyam yaśasvini
(I. III. 32).

These appeals are backed by an interesting episode about the ethical aspect of this ancient *āpad-dharma* illustrated by the story of Vyuṣitāśva and Bhadrā, which Kuntī skilfully brings in, urging Pāṇḍu to employ his superior Yoga power to generate children through her, just as the dead body of Vyuṣitāśva generated the three Śālvas and four Madras through Bhadrā. But Pāṇḍu overrides these objections on the part of Kuntī, quoting the authority of Śvetaketu Auddālaki, and the ancient examples of Madayantī, wife of Saudāsa who obtained Aśmaka as a son through Vaśiṣṭha, of the wife of Kalmāṣapāda and the wives of Vicitravīrya who followed through necessity this *āpad-dharma*. Kuntī apprises him of the boon given her by the sage Durvāsas while she was serving him in her father's house:

mantragrāmaṃ ca me prādād abravīc caiva mām idam
(I. 113. 34[cd]).

yam yam devam tvam etena mantreṇāvāhayiṣyasi
akāmo vā sakāmo vā sa te vaśam upaiṣyati (I. 113.35)

and as a result she and Mādrī call upon the five gods mentioned in I. 1.69 and beget the five Pāṇḍavas.

Now with regard to this *Dharmopaniṣad* at I. 1.69 *b*, we observe the following variant: T_1 G_7 M (except M_1) *mantropaniṣad*, *dharma*—being substituted by the word

mantra— in order to agree with the *mantra-grāma* of I. 113.34 or the well-known episode of the boon of the *mantras* given to Kuntī by the sage Durvāsas, referred to by Nīlakaṇṭha in his gloss. But this Southern variant is borne out only by one Telugu, one Grantha and three Malayalam MSS. As opposed to this, in the interpolated passage 32* attested by D_{10-11} T G_{4-6} we have the following four lines:

tāto dharmopaniṣadam bhūtvā bhartuḥ priyā Pṛthā

Dharm-Ānīl-Endrāms tābhiḥ sā-juhāva sutavāñchayā

Taddattopaniṣan-Mādrī cĀśvināv ājuhāva ca

Jātāḥ Pārthās tataḥ sarve Kuntyā Mādryāś ca mantrataḥ

with the variants D_{10-11} T_2 *dharmopaniṣado dhṛtvā*, and G_6 *dharmopaniṣadam śrutvā*, and there is no variant for the third line. Thus the manuscript evidence is definitely in favour of *dharma*—in *Dharmopaniṣad*, including the scholia of Devabodha and Nīlakaṇṭha.

P. C. Roy's translation of this verse is as follows: "Their mothers, that the ordinances of the law might be fulfilled, admitted as substitutes to their embraces the gods Dharma, Vāyu, Śakra and the two Aśvins."

Mookerji's translation of the same passage reads as follows: "In the forest Kuntī and Mādrī gave births (*sic*!) to the Pāṇḍavas in fulfilment of the ordinances of religion, their fathers being the five gods."

Roy would have *dharma* as 'law' and Mookerji as 'religion' and *upaniṣad* as 'ordinance' in both cases, *abhyupapatti* as 'fulfilment.' It seems to me that these English translators have missed something of the inner purport of all the three words by attempting a general translation of the passage as a whole.

The base *abhy-upa-pad* has the root meaning of 'to approach' and when the context shows the object to be a

woman, it develops a technical significance of 'to approach for sexual intercourse' for begetting children as a religious duty. Thus, *abhyupapatti* means 'impregnation of a woman' and the literal translation of I. 1. 69 would be: 'The impregnation of the two mothers through Dharma, Vāyu, Śakra, and the two Aśvins by means of the secret *mantras* compelling (the gods to. perform the particular duty).' *Dharma* stands for *Āpad-dharma* and *upaniṣad* for the *mantragrāma*. It is surprising that the true meaning of *abhyupapatti* in this context is recorded only in a lexicographical work.[5]

---

[5] Cf. Moniar-Williams, *Sanskrit English Dictionary* (1895) s. v. *abhyupapatti*.

VIKRAMORVAŚĪYA—A STUDY

By Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti

'Love, when it unites heaven and earth, transcends the limitations of time and space.'

From the point of view of chronology and literary merit the *Vikramorvaśīya*[1] ranks midway between *Mālvikāgnimitra* and *Śākuntala*. The theme of the drama, the love between Purūravas and Urvaśī, is as old as the oldest strata of the Vedic literature.[2] In the course of its passage through the long vista of centuries, the story has undergone considerable modification and this has enabled the poet to reconstruct a dramatic version out of it without doing violence to the Puranic theme. He has successfully humanised the characters, enlivened it with wit and humour, introduced varied dramatic contrivances and lastly, added scenic attractions.[3] Love between human and divine is always tragic in character, but the poet has lifted the tragic element out of the story and has made it an orthodox Indian drama. The course of love never runs smooth, but at the same time it never fails to attain the *summum bonum* of bliss and enjoyment, provided it is self-abnegating; and so the poet has depicted the love of Purūravas and Urvaśī as being characterised by mutual

---

[1] The references to the text are to the edition of *Virkramorvaśīya*, issued in the *Bombay Sanskrit Series*, No. xvi. The Roman figures refer to the acts, while the ordinary figures refer to the sections numbered in the edition.

[2] *Vide Appendix III* attached to the edition; *vide* also the writer's paper, *Vikramorvaśīya—A study of the Sources*, published in the Maharaja's College Magazine, Ernakulam, Vol. XXII, No. iii, pp. 206—212.

[3] The subject is dealt with in Prof. Ryder's *Sākuntala*, published in the *Everyman's Series*.

sacrifice and surrender.[4] The drama thus forms a thesis on love. An aspect of this is the theme of this paper.

The first act of the drama is composed of a *Sthāpana* or prologue and the main scene. The prominent sentiment of the act is given expression to towards the close of the prologue: it is the sentiment of fear and anxiety[5] and it is carried over to the main scene, when the same words are repeated by the celestial damsels floating in the air.[6] In striking contrast to this is the introduction of the king, riding in his own chariot through the aerial regions and announcing himself in strict royal dignity and reserve that he is king Purūravas ready to render help to the distressed.[7] Anxiety and helplessness are here counterbalanced by valour and heroism—the former associated with the denizens of the air and the latter with a denizen of the earth—and the varied emotions are bridged over from the one to the other by the emotion of wonder. The king wonders that *Apsara* women should have cause for fear, being directly under the protection of Indra, and these are surprised that a mortal king should have come at the nick of time and volunteered help. Thus the opening of the drama presents a delicate emotion contrast which is happily enhanced by character contrast as well.

The main scene passes through three stages, the first running from the beginning till the exit of the king after the *Dānava*, the second till the entrance of Citraratha and the rest forming the third stage. The first of these is characterised by fear and anxiety, which are, however, toned down by wonder and the prospect of relief in the timely appearance of the king. In the next stage the king is glad that he has been able to save Urvaśī and is lost in

[4] III—134, 140, etc.

[5] I—8.

[6] I—9.

[7] I—10, 14 and 16.

admiration of the extraordinary loveliness[8] of the woman he has been able to save, while the maid Citralekhā is still anxious that her mistress is not yet recovered from her swoon.[9] As the scene proceeds, the sense of gladness, in the case of the king, recedes into the background and is replaced by love for Urvaśī[10] and sorrow in the case of Citralekhā is replaced by gladness that her friend has completely recovered. As regards Urvaśī, the original fear and dread now give way to profound thankfulness and gratitude[11] towards the king which soon become metamorphosed into love.[12] And towards the close of the second stage, the main sentiment is one of thankfulness[13] on the part of the nymphs that their friend is saved and that the king is unhurt, and they are therefore filled with respectful admiration for the gallant king, whom they bless with long life.[14] Thus at the close of the second stage the emotions of the various parties undergo a specific change. At this stage, Indra's charioteer enters to convey to the king his master's appreciation of the gallant rescue effected by the king and to invite him to heaven.[15] The element of honour contained in this invitation is equalled only by the modesty of the king, his respect and reverence.[16] At the close of the Act the leave taking of the party is marked by the bringing into prominence again of the mutual love of Purūravas[17] and Urvaśī,[18] who go their different ways, casting longing looks at each other.[19]

---

[8] I—28, 31 and 34.
[9] I—28 and 34.
[10] I—33.
[11] I—37 and 42.
[12] I—37, 94 and 95.
[13] I—48 and 49.
[14] I—61.
[15] I—66.
[16] I—67, 68 and 69.
[17] I—78.
[18] I—74, 75 and 76.
[19] I—81 and 82.

Such is the emotion delineation in the first Act. The emotion of fear and distress, passing through wonder and gratitude into love-longing-for-union, in the case of Urvaśī, is artistically interwoven with the king's *Utsāha* which, passing through wonder and admiration, also becomes metamorphosed into love-longing-for-union; and this unfolding of mutual love is given an aerial setting,[20] not unworthy of the divine nymph and the semi-divine king.

The second Act elaborates the love-longing-for-union, and here the emotion contrast is replaced by emotion intensity. The interlude depicts the love-lorn condition of the king[21] against the background of the foolishness[22] of the Vidūṣaka, which is, however, balanced by the skill of the queen's maid.[23] The main scene can be divided as before into four sections: the first running from the opening of the scene till the arrival of Urvaśī, the second till Urvaśī manifests herself, the third till she makes her exit, and the last beginning with the arrival of the queen.

In the first section we have the king presented as pining for Urvaśī[24] and his love-pangs are relieved not by Vidūṣaka, but by a vague inkling of the coming union with his beloved, which keeps him hopeful.[25] Then Urvaśī is introduced as being completely overwhelmed by love-longing-for-union,[26] and she experiences a thrill of

---

20 I—23. The stage direction there shows that they were till then floatisg in the air. *Vide* also stage direction after seetion 73. It is also clear from the description that the king was travelling in the air in his own car. The subject is dealt with in some detail in the writer's paper, *Kalidasa—The Dramatist*, published in the *Annamalai University Journal*.

21 II—1, also 9.

22 II—9.

23 II—6, 8, 10 and 18.

24 II—15, 35, 37 and 40.

25 II—54.

26 II—56, 57, 58 and 62.

gladness when she learns that the king is suffering equally for her sake.[27] It is a dramatic situation in which Urvaśī stands besides the king, unseen to him, listening to his tale of love-woe. She has now her doubts completely set at rest, if indeed she had any regarding the depth and sincerity of the king's love, and naturally enough she becomes filled with ecstatic bliss. The intensity of king's love melts her heart, and she sends him a message of love on a *Bhūrjapatra*[28] and this gladdens the king's heart.[29] The mutual knowledge that love is reciprocated infuses new joy in both[30] and this attains full development, when Urvaśī manifests herself before the king.[31] The couple experience the thrill of mutual vision and bodily contact,[32] but, then with the rare restraint that is characteristic of the great poet, the new-found joy is not allowed to continue for long: for, a divine voice directs the presence of Urvaśī elsewhere,[33] and sadly she has to bid adieu to her lover.[34] The *Bhūrjapatra*, which has been the harbinger of joy and happiness, is sought after by the king as a source of relief,[35] but, thanks to the carelessness of Vidūṣaka, it could not be found.[36] Instead it has reached the queen[37] and has helped to introduce a further complication.[38] the queen is convinced of the king's new amour, and a new emotion complex of anger and jealousy

---

[27] II—83, 85 and 90.
[28] II—90.
[29] II—96 and 103.
[30] II—103 and 107.
[31] II—117.
[32] II—120: the stage direction following.
[33] II—124.
[34] II—130.
[35] II—137.
[36] II—138.
[37] II—145 and 146.
[38] II—151.

is introduced.[39] The second Act, then, develops the love theme of the king: first the intensity of his passion is set forth, then his hopes and their partial fulfilment by letter, and last the bliss of happiness by the vision of Urvaśī and her confession of love. Then it is raised up to the highest pitch, but later converted into love-longing-for-reunion through the forced departure of Urvaśī, which is further complicated by the queen's knowledge of the king's love affair and the consequent broken domestic felicity.[40] The struggle between unfulfilled love with reference to Urvaśī and broken pride and wounded honour with reference to the queen[41]—the one as strong as the other and each struggling for mastery[42]—such is the emotion complex presented towards the close of the Act.

The third Act has two main divisions—the Miśra-viṣkambhaka and the main scene. The former is an informative scene, describing how Urvaśī has been cursed[43] for failure in her duty by Bharata and how that curse has later been modified by Indra which enabled her to consort with Purūravas.[44] The main scene is given a handsome setting in the matter of time and space;[45] and there now meet the king, pining for Urvaśī[46] and the queen, haughty yet repentant and therefore desirous of appeasing the king.[47] There again the king has his first premonitions

---

[39] II—169-173.

[40] II—169—71 and 173.

[41] II—143, 163 and 175.

[42] II—175.

[43] III—10 and 12.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] A royal procession marching past and ascending the stairs leading from the banks of the Ganges, lit up below by torches and above by the rising moon presents an interesting picture and in a well-set stage it is bound to be very effective.

[46] III—33, 34, 35 and 36.

[47] III—15, 17 and 22.

of the coming union with Urvaśī,[48] which are utilised to introduce her as she floats through the air.[49] The entrance of the king, then of Urvaśī, and then of the queen followed by her exit—these mark certain well-defined stages in the progress of the scene. And throughout all these, except the very last, the predominant emotion is that of love-longing-for-reunion which has also an undercurrent of consideration for the queen in the case of Purūravas[50] and of jealousy for her in the case of Urvaśī.[51] This undercurrent exhausts itself when the queen presents herself and permits the union of the king and Urvaśī.[52] Consequently, the love-longing-for-reunion is again brought up to the forefront, and it attains consummation, when Urvaśī finally becomes united with the king.[53] As far as Urvaśī is concerned, she is first weighed with love-longing-for-union with an undercurrent of doubt, regarding the attitude of the queen[54] and the depth of king's love. These are allowed to exhaust themselves in the second and third stages of the Act. Urvaśī now knows definitely that the king is doting on her alone[55] and the nobility[56] of the queen's action not only reassures her but begets admiration in her.[57] This naturally fills her with unbounded joy.[58] Thus the hero and the heroine have their sideral emotions completely removed and both alike are filled only with one emotion—the emotion of love-longing-for-reunion

---

48 III—34—38.

49 *Vide* the stage direction following 38.

50 III—85, 90, 92 and 97.

51 III—82, 83, 91 and 92.

52 III—102, 103, 104, 106, 108 and 111.

53 III—118, 122, 123 and 124.

54 III—44, 45, 47 and 50.

55 III—61, 62 and 64.

56 III—103.

57 III—104.

58 III—116.

which has been ennobled on account of suffering.[59] As in the second Act, but unlike in the first Act, here the emotion delineation is in the direction of intensiveness, rather than complication. There are no contrasts, but the necessary effects are produced by bringing into contact different parties moved by similar emotions. Acts II and III are characterised by great delicacy of emotion delineation.

The first three Acts of the drama form the first part. In Act I the seeds of love are sown between the human and the divine through pity on the part of the former and gratitude on the part of the latter. The air is made the locus of action, as is befitting the nature of the heroine who is a denizen of the air and of the hero who is a semi-divine being. Act II describes the development of this love which has become all-engrossing. The nymph forgets her heavenly duties lost in her new-found love; the king forgets his wedded love: in other words, both forget *samudācāra* in the intensity of their new-found love. Act III describes how the various complications which stand in the way of the consummation of their love are got over. Indra, out of gratitude for services rendered to him by the king, permits Urvaśī to consort with him for a period; and the queen, out of repentance for her haughty conduct, permits the king to consort with Urvaśī. Thus the human and the divine are brought together by gratitude on the part of Urvaśī's master[60] and repentance on the part of Purūravas' mistress.[61] So far as Urvaśi is concerned, however, the enjoyment of their love is conditioned by her master; but such all-engrossing love, despite its innate tragic nature, cannot be evanescent: it must be made permanent. This is the theme of the next two Acts, which thus forms Part II of the drama.

[59] III—143.
[60] III—12.
[61] III—22, 77, and 102.

Act IV is composed of two scenes, the interlude and the main scene. In the former, we are regaled to a conversation between Citralekhā and her nurse, which describes the calamity which has befallen Purūravas,[62] and which also suggests the possibility of their reunion.[63] The new-found happiness of the couple is disturbed by a touch of jealousy,[64] as is always the case with such unnatural love, and, as fate would have it, Urvaśī becomes transformed into a creeper[65] and the king becomes steeped in intense misery.[66] The dramatist moralises that such must be end of such love[67]—unnatural so far as the parties are concerned, unnatural in its intensity, and unnatural as far as the mode of enjoyment is concerned.[68] At the same time there is hope expressed of a reunion. This scene forms a happy contrast to the last stage of the last Act: here the *Sambhoga-śṛṅgāra* becomes transformed into genuine *Vipralambha*, idealised love-longing-for-reunion.[69]

The main scene opens with the king himself who appears madness personified,[70] a madness which is the

---

[62] IV—8-12.

[63] IV—13.

[64] IV—8.

[65] IV—10.

[66] IV—12.

[67] IV—11.

[68] IV—6 and 7.

[69] IV—13.

[70] Here one interesting point deserves to be noticed: the hero is in a demented condition and as such, words do not count, cannot be taken at their face value. Indeed nobody attaches much significance to the ravings of a mad man, even when his words are true and significant. Naturally enough we do not attach much importance to his words. Similarly, here we should not attach much importance to the words uttered by the king. Their value lies, as in the case of a mad man, in their suggestive sense: we have to take them as indicating the stage of his malady, that is the keenness of his love-woe. This is an important aspect of this scene. The investation of a love-mad man's incoherent utterances with significance and their presentation in an artistic form is the unique achievement of the art of the great dramatist.

necessary result of deep and intense sorrow. He roams about in the Gandhamādana forest in search of his beloved.[71] He is convinced that Urvaśī cannot be far away, because such is the intensity of their love and hence, he believes that she must be hiding somewhere near to tease him.[72] Thus he justifies his search. It reaches the second stage when Urvaśī reappears,[73] the way for which has already been prepared by the acquisition of the Saṅgamaṇi gem[74] and the assurance given by a divine voice.[75] The description of the sorrow of separation and the joy of reunion rises up to the highset pitch, only the latter is drawn not in the same high pitch as the sorrow. It is a highly poetic scene and forms a notable instance of the description of *Vipralambha-Śṛṅgāra*, rivalled, if at all, only by that in that perfect gem of a lyric, the *Meghasandeśa*.

The fourth Act describes the quest of beanty. Purūravas sees beauty everywhere, but not the ideal he has realised. Likeness to his beloved he sees in the varied aspects of nature and he conceives human life one with the environments, co-extensive with nature—fauna, flora, inanimate nature, such as running brooks, mountain peaks, clouds, etc., beauty being the unifying factor. Wherever is beauty present, there Purūravas suspects the presence of his beloved, Urvaśī, who combines the ideal with the real, so far at least as he is concerned. Here, then, is unity of all life elaborated on an aesthetic basis. Creative beauty is charming whatever be the form in which it appears: an antelope, a swan, a river, a cuckoo, a tree,

---

71 IV—14: the stage direction preceding.
72 IV—6 and 12.
73 IV—18.
74 *Vide* the stage direction following IV—53.
75 IV—49.
76 IV—50.

or an elephant—each one of these can be as delightful as any human form that an artist can bring into existence. This is the great lesson that the poet teaches in this Act. And finally, the king realises his ideal of beauty not in glorious things, but in a simple creeper void of tendrils,[76] void of shoots, void of buds, void of flowers; it is such a plant that yields him the delight of his heart. The ideal of beauty is thus always subjective in character and it has to be realised through the real which comes within the purview of the individual.

The fifth Act is of one scene, passing through a number of stages. Vidūṣaka opens the scene : he is happy that the king has returned from the Nandana forest and is ruling the kingdom happily with, however, one source of sorrow that he is childless.[77] The lifting of this sorrow involves the prospect of a deeper sorrow. This constitutes the complicating factor of the Act. The tone of sadness is emphasised and made more acute by the loss of the Saṅgamaṇi jewel, which is picked up by an eagle, mistaking it for a piece of flesh,[78] and it sets the whole court astir. This sadness is balanced by a touch of valour,[79] when the king starts in pursuit thereof.[80] But the eagle darts away and is soon beyond the arrow of the king[81] and therefore with orders to watch the bird as it returns to its roost,[82] he returns immersed in sorrow, not that he lost a jewel, but the jewel which reunited him with his beloved.[83] Before long, news is brought that the bird is killed and the gem recovered;[84] and with the gem is brought the arrow

---

[77] IV—52.

[78] V—1.

[79] V—2 and 3.

[80] V—4 and 6.

[81] *Vide* stage direction after V—S.

[82] V—13.

[83] *Ibid.*

[84] V—16.

which killed the bird—the arrow marked with the name of *Ayus*.[85] The king is glad and he is gladder of the prospect of his having a son born to him.[86] With the entrance of the son,[87] the second stage of the scene is ushered in and this raised the king's gladness to its highest pitch.[88] Then the question rises : why did Urvaśī hide his son from him? This doubt, as the sequel shows, becomes a source of very poignant sorrow. Urvaśī comes and explains why the child has been kept away and what the result is of his seeing him.[89] The touch of tenderness and simplicity marks the leave taking of Urvaśī: the story is unfolded in all its details and everybody is drowned in intense sorrow. At this supreme moment is introduced Nārada[90] who brings the glad tidings that Urvaśī is permitted to consort with the king till his death.[91] This is very happy news and all are immersed in bliss ecstatic, which reaches its peak when *Ayus* is crowned king by Nārada himself.[92] Be it, however, noted that there is here introduced a change in the nature of the love : romance or *Kāma* is replaced by a *Dharma* element.[93]

We have in the preceding sketched briefly the development of the emotion of love in the *Vikramorvaśīya;* and our study shows that the drama portrays love in its two aspects of love-in-enjoyment and love-in-suffering. The delineation is characterised not by great contrasts, not by serious complications, not by unexpected resolutions, but

---

[85] V—18.
[86] V—22 and 29.
[87] V—29 and 30.
[88] *Vide* stage direction following V—37.
[89] V—40 and 60.
[90] V—95.
[91] V—105.
[92] V—120.
[93] V—127.
[94] V—120. Compare also III—13.

by delicacy and intensiveness, scarcely paralleled elsewhere in the whole range of our literature. It is supernatural love; it has an elevated tone about it, not unworthy of the great hero, not unworthy of the celestial nymph. On the face of it, it is not normal love: but Purūravas suffers again and again, and thus makes himself worthy of the love of a celestial nymph. Thus the whole drama forms a thesis on love.

We shall not better conclude this brief study than with a reference to what appears to be an abnormal condition imposed upon the union of Purūravas and Urvaśī. The fruition of their love in the shape of a son is to be the end of the bliss of love;[94] and note Urvaśī is to separate from the king, only when the latter visualises his child.[95] What it may be asked the rationale of this queer condition imposed their enjoyment of love and that by Indra who wishes well by both?

Urvaśī is a celestial and she has therefore her well-defined duties in heaven,[96] while Purūravas is a mortal. Hence permanency for this love is impossible and it must necessarily have a time-limit. The condition imposed gives, as the sequel shows, freedom of fixing up the time-limit to Urvaśī and this explains why Purūravas is kept ignorant of the condition. Being a celestial, Urvaśī can presumably control conception and, if by an accident, conception takes place, she can, if necessary, hide her issue from the king. Urvaśī thus gets freedom to leave Purūravas when she feels tired of him, unless she is forced to leave him earlier by an accidental breach of the condition. In other words, the time-limit laid down ensures the union of the couple so long as there is mutual love present, in the absence of which the woman is free to move away. that is to say, it is based upon not external circumstances,

---

95 III—13.
96 *Ibid*.

but upon mutual sex-appeal and sex-attraction; and at the same time, it provides for the birth of an issue for Purūravas, whose one source of sorrow has been childlessness.[97] Thus, it will be seen that the condition imposed is after all not so unnatural as it apparently looks: on the other hand it takes full cognisance of the peculiar nature of this most human of all emotions and at the same time it does not take away from the grace of the gift which Indra makes to his friend and ally Purūravas and to his favourite mistress.[98]

As the sequel shows, it is again accident, and not satiation of love that raises the prospect of separation.[99] This is well revealed in the extreme sorrow with which Urvaśī prepares for her departure[100] and the king's loss of interest in life,[101] who therefore prepares to renounce life.[102] Accident has brought the couple together and here accident is about to force them apart, despite their intense mutual love; and so accident[103] again helps them to continue in the path of love. The prospect of a war between the Devas and Asuras necessitates that Purūravas should not renounce life, and this necessitates that Indra should allow Urvaśī to stay with Purūravas. And this continuance of conjugal bliss is perfectly in keeping with the beginnings of their love: it begins in king's heroism and Urvaśī's helplessness, and it is now made permanent because of the king's heroism and Indra's helplessness. None but the brave wins the fair, and none but the brave can keep the fair after winning.

---

97 *Vide* I—13.

98 *Ibid*.

99 III—12.

100 The getting of the arrow and the recognition of Ayus are accidental.

101 V—91 and 95.

102 V—99.

103 V—120 and 123.

In this phase of the delineation of love there is revealed another interesting trait: it is eminently human from the beginning to the end; and like all romantic love, the more important stages of its growth and development are controlled by accident, or to use the familiar Indian expression, *Fate*. Indeed Love transcends the limitations of time and space.

THE ĀGAMAŚĀSTRA OF GAUḌAPĀDA: edited, translated and annotated. By Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya. Pp. cxlvi + 308. University of Calcutta, 1943.

The present work popularly known as *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* or *Gauḍapādakārikā* is also called *Āgamaśāstra*, perhaps because in the colophons of certain MSS of the commentary by Śaṅkara, the name *Āgamaśāstravivaraṇa* has been found mentioned. It is one of the most important works on the origin of Vedānta due to which the work is sometimes named *Vedāntamūla* also

Pandit Vidhushekhara Śāstrī has been working on it for over twenty years and it is gratifying to see the results of his studies in such an excellent form. He has taken great pains in placing before the scholarly world a correct text with the help of several MSS. His introduction, notes, etc., are quite exhaustive and comprehensive. The scholarly world is indebted to Śāstrījī for this excellent edition of *Gauḍapādakārikā*. Prof. Śāstrī's contributions to Indian Philosophy, particularly Buddhism, is too well known. Several years ago he advocated that there is enough influence of Buddhism on Gauḍapāda. He holds the same view even now. Gradually he has become much more confirmed in his view. He is not at all satisfied with the interpretation of Śaṅkara, and thinks that Gauḍapāda, though a true *Advaitin*, is influenced by the Buddhist thoughts. He identifies the view of Gauḍapāda with that of the *Vijñānavāda*. It is true, holds Prof. Śāstrī, that Gauḍapāda advocates the *Vijñānavāda* in his *Kārikās*, but certainly, he takes the *Bṛhadāranyaka Upanisad* as the basis for his statement, and thus shows that there is an agreement between Vedānta and *Vijñānavāda*. Prof. Śāstrī says: "This Upanisadic seed of

idealism, being influenced by its elaborate system in Buddhism and the vast literature on it by the Buddhist teachers who flourished before Gauḍapāda, has developed into what we now find in the *Āgamaśāstra*. But when there are the above and the similar germs of idealism in the *Upaniṣads* it must be accepted that it did not first originate with the Buddhists, though it has much developed in their system later on, etc." Now, from the above also it is clear that the germs of Buddhist thought are found in our *Upaniṣads*, which have been developed by the Buddhist *Ācāryas* in later centuries, while the orthodox section did not make any effort to advance on what the *Upaniṣads* have said. It is also a fact that though there is enough similarity between Gauḍapāda and Buddhism, as has been shown by Prof. Śāstrī himself, their views differ in many respects. As such, would it not be then proper to say that Gauḍapāda with his wide experience of Buddhist thoughts has only been reminded of the original view as advocated in the *Upaniṣads* and has developed the same in his *Kārikās*? To say that the *Kārikās* have been written under the influence of Buddhism does not appear to be so satisfying when we can trace the sources of both to the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. If, however, we mean by the influence of Buddhism that the revival of the old view of the *Upaniṣads* was due to the influence of Buddhist thoughts, then there is nothing to differ.

As to the title of the book—*Āgamaśāstra*—the reason given by Śāstrījī does not quite convince us. If that treatise which is based on traditional doctrines be named *Āgamaśāstra* then Iśvarakṛṣṇa's *Kārikās* on Sāṅkhya and similar other books also will have to be called by this name; for we know that in order to show the authenticity of a work; it is found that its author always likes to base it on old traditions. That one or two MSS have got the name in their colophons may be due to the fact that the first

section of the book is named *Āgamaprakaraṇa;* and perhaps it may also be due to the fact that those who want to show that the *Kārikās* have been written under Buddhist influence would like to give this name to it. However, we are very thankful to Śāstrījī for placing before us a new line of thinking.

COSMOLOGY OLD AND NEW : being a modern commentary of the fifth chapter of Shri Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra. By G. R. Jain, M. Sc. J. L. Jaini Memorial Series. No. IX. 6 + xiv + 255. To be had from: The Central Jain Publishing House, Ajitashrama, Lucknow. Rs. 4-8-0.

The book under review is a free English translation of the Fifth Chapter of the well-known Jaina canonical work —*Tattvārthādhigama-Sūtra* of Umāsvātī, also known as Umāsvāmī who is believed to be the foremost disciple of Kundakundācārya. Umāsvātī, according to the Jaina tradition, lived from about 135 A.D. to 219 A.D. It contains ten chapters. It is respected both by the *Digambara* and the *Śvetāmbara* sections of the Jaina community. Even today it is read with devotion by almost all Jainas in private houses and temples as a sacred book. It alone teaches us an account of the logic, psychology, cosmology, ontology and ethics of the Jainas. Hence, it is regarded as a sacred epitome of Jainism. It has got a very fine commentary by the author himself. It has been published several times and has been also translated into English by Mr. J. L. Jaini for the *Sacred Books of the Jainas Series.*

Now, here is a fresh attempt to translate the Fifth Chapter alone with exhaustive notes into English by Prof. G. R. Jain. This chapter deals with Metaphysics, Physics, Chemistry, space, time, matter, heat, sound, light, motion, etc. The translator has not only taken great pains to explain the *Sūtras* in their true sense but has also gone

beyond the scope of the school to compare and contrast the views with those of other systems of Indian thought. This sort of comparative study is really useful and desirable for a comprehensive study of any system. But the translator has not confined himself within the limits of the various schools of Indian philosophy, he has gone beyond these and has made efforts to compare and contrast the views found in Jainism with the researches of modern sciences. Here there is bound to be some difference of opinion. It is just possible that we may have some common features in the two thoughts, but we know that the researches in the modern sciences are based on matter and such products of matter where one can easily have experiments performed. The modern sciences have purely materialistic outlook. The schools of Indian philosophy, on the other hand, carry their analysis of elements to such subtle stages as the modern methods fail to understand. Again, the Indian outlook is not merely materialistic but also psychic and spiritual. It is very difficult to extricate the last two aspects from our studies of Indian thought. Thus our standpoint being quite different, how can there be any comparison at all? Then, to try to find out the developments of the modern sciences in our systems also does not appear to serve any useful purpose. I would rather like, as the translator has promised, that independent efforts should be made on the basis of the data supplied by our thoughts to study critically what contributions have been made by our ancestors in the past and how far we can make any further additions to those. I think more useful purpose can be served by such independent researches in the field of knowledge than by merely making efforts to show and prove our superiority to the researches of others.

It is, however, very gratifying to see that the translator has made in this book an attempt to put before the English-knowing public and to the scholarly world at

large, the contributions of the Jainas in the domain of cosmology and atomic physics and that this attempt is not to seek in ancient texts the substance of modern theories. No doubt, much work is yet to be done in this respect, but it is very necessary to keep always in mind that one does not become over-enthusiastic and goes beyond the limits of the texts. Then, again, it is also equally necessary to remember that while tracing the exclusive contributions of Jainism one should know that it is so in reality. It is a fact that the systems of Realistic thoughts in India have more or less contributed to physics and chemistry (*vide—Positive Sciences of the Hindus* by Sir B. N. Seal and *Hindu Chemistry* by Sir P. C. Roy) and it is very difficult to say which system of the thought has first advocated a particular view. Now, here in this very book Prof. Jain says —"The 'animistic' belief of the Jains that the plants are endowed with life, etc.," but Mr. Jain is aware that almost all the schools of Indian thought believe in this and it is not easy to attribute this view to any one school exclusively.

After these few suggestions I heartily congratulate the translator for such an attempt.

The following articles will be published in the subsequent numbers of the Journal :—

1. **The Islamic Conception of the Soul. By Dr. M. G. Zubaid Ahmad, Allahabad.**
2. **The Maghas of South Kosala. By Dr. A. S. Altekar, Benares.**
3. **Some dated Manuscripts of the *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda Vāgīśa and their bearing on the Limits for his Date (A D. 1500 to 1600) By Mr. P. K. Gode, Poona.**
4. **Instances of the Auxiliary Verb in the *Suttanipāta*. By Dr. Babu Ram Saksena, Allahabad.**
5. **The Puraṇic Date of the *Mahābhārata* War. By Mr. M Raja Rao, Mysore..**

6. Analysis of Verbal forms of Maithilī. By Pt. Subhadra Jha, Darbhanga.
7. The Purāṇika view of the *Saptarṣi* cycle. By Mr. M. Raja Rao, Mysore.
8. Kapila Eclipse. By Dr. Shama Sastri, Mysore.
9. Authorship of the *Setubandha*. By Mr. Ramaji Upadhyaya, Allahabad.
10. Research in Indian Philosophy—A Review. By Dr. P. T. Rajū, Annamalai University.
11. Siddha Śāstra. By Mr. K. R. R. Sastry, Allahabad.
12. Sanskrit Versions of Foreign Works. By Shri Raghuvara Mithulal Sastri, Allahabad.
13. Gleanings from Somadeva Sūri's *Yaśastilaka Campū*. By Dr. V. Raghavan, Madras.
14. Some Unpublished Maithilī Songs. By Pt. Ramanatha Jha, Darbhanga.